DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 531 CE 028 383

AUTHOR Tanimura, Clinton T.
TITLE Job Sharing Pilot Project in the Department of Education: Final Evaluation. A Report to the Legislature of the State of Hawaii. No. 81-10.
INSTITUTION Hawaii State Legislature, Honolulu. Senate.
PUB DATE Mar 81
NOTE 62p.; Tables, footnotes, and some textual information will not reproduce well due to small print. For a related document see CE 027 952.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Demonstration Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Employment Practices; *Feasibility Studies; *Partnership Teachers; Part Time Employment; *Program Costs; *Program Effectiveness; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS Hawaii; *Job Sharing

ABSTRACT

Evaluation of a three-year pilot project in the Hawaii Department of Education focused on the extent to which it demonstrated the feasibility of job sharing as an employment alternative for classroom teachers. It also assessed project effectiveness, examined costs incurred by the project, and analyzed job sharing as a permanent employment option and issues relating to job sharing. The project was found to be effective in achieving objectives of the job sharing program. These were to offer an alternative employment option, to provide more employment opportunities for unemployed teachers, to create more stimulating environments for tenured teachers, and to provide additional educational stimulus for students. Examination of the total costs of the pilot project showed that savings in direct operating costs continued to accrue to the state. Administrative costs continued to be minimal, while the main cost savings consideration were the lower earnings of the new hires as compared to tenured teachers. Considerations in establishing job sharing as a permanent employment option were determined, including elegibility restrictions, collective bargaining considerations, effect on retirement benefits, teaching conditions and requirements, and recruitment of new hires. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199531

JOB SHARING PILOT PROJECT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: FINAL EVALUATION

A Report to the Legislature of the State of Hawaii

Submitted by the
Legislative Auditor of the State of Hawaii

CE028383

Report No. 81—10
March 1981

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Newton Sue

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

The office of the legislative auditor is a public agency attached to the Hawaii State legislature. It is established by Article VII, Section 10, of the Constitution of the State of Hawaii. The expenses of the office are financed through appropriations made by the legislature.

The primary function of this office is to strengthen the legislature's capabilities in making rational decisions with respect to authorizing public programs, setting program levels, and establishing fiscal policies and in conducting an effective review and appraisal of the performance of public agencies.

The office of the legislative auditor endeavors to fulfill this responsibility by carrying on the following activities.

1. Conducting examinations and tests of state agencies' planning, programming, and budgeting processes to determine the quality of these processes and thus the pertinence of the actions requested of the legislature by these agencies.

2. Conducting examinations and tests of state agencies' implementation processes to determine whether the laws, policies, and programs of the State are being carried out in an effective, efficient, and economical manner.

3. Conducting systematic and periodic examinations of all financial statements prepared by and for all state and county agencies to attest to their substantial accuracy and reliability.

4. Conducting tests of all internal control systems of state and local agencies to ensure that such systems are properly designed to safeguard the agencies' assets against loss from waste, fraud, error, etc.; to ensure the legality, accuracy, and reliability of the agencies' financial transaction records and statements; to promote efficient operations; and to encourage adherence to prescribed management policies.

5. Conducting special studies and investigations as may be directed by the legislature.

Hawaii's laws provide the legislative auditor with broad powers to examine and inspect all books, records, statements, documents, and all financial affairs of every state and local agency. However, the office exercises no control functions and is restricted to reviewing, evaluating, and reporting its findings and recommendations to the legislature and the governor. The independent, objective, and impartial manner in which the legislative auditor is required to conduct his examinations provides the basis for placing reliance on his findings and recommendations.

LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR
KEKUANAO'A BUILDING, RM. 500
465 SOUTH KING STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

FOREWORD

Through the passage of Act 150 in 1978, the Legislature authorized the establishment of a three-year job sharing pilot project in the Department of Education (DOE). The Legislature's purpose was to test and examine the feasibility of job sharing as an employment alternative for classroom teachers. In addition, it was viewed as an opportunity to provide jobs for the unemployed teachers in the State.

Under the job sharing act, our office is responsible for monitoring and evaluating the pilot project and for reporting our findings and recommendations in a series of status reports. Accordingly, two such reports were submitted to the Legislature during the 1979 and 1980 legislative sessions. The first report dealt with the progress made in implementing the pilot project, the various demographic characteristics of the participants, and some of the problems and issues which had emerged. The second report evaluated the implementation of the pilot project by DOE during the 1979 spring semester and the 1979–80 school year.

This report is the third of the required reports. It presents the results of our final evaluation of the pilot project during the remainder of its test period and concludes with an analysis of the alternative of establishing job sharing as a permanent employment option.

We wish to acknowledge the excellent cooperation and assistance extended to our staff by the teachers, principals, and other personnel of DOE, especially its Office of Personnel Services; the students taught by job sharers; the parents of students in job sharing classes; the representatives of the collective bargaining units; and the many other public officials and private parties who were contacted during the course of our evaluation.

Clinton T. Tanimura
Legislative Auditor
State of Hawaii

March 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		*Page*
1	INTRODUCTION	
	Objectives of the Evaluation	1
	Scope of the Evaluation	1
	Evaluation Methodology	1
	Organization of the Report	2
	Terminology	2
2	SOME BACKGROUND	
	Present Size of the Pilot Project	3
	Demographic Characteristics of Job Sharers	4
	Manner in Which Jobs Are Shared	4
	Summary	7
3	PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS	
	Summary of Findings	9
	Alternative Employment Option	10
	Employment Opportunities for Unemployed Teachers	16
	Stimulating Environments for Tenured Teachers	17
	Impact on Quality of Education	21
	Summary	24
4	PROGRAM COSTS	
	Summary of Findings	27
	Direct Operating Costs	27
	Administrative Costs	30
	Summary	33
5	CONSIDERATIONS IN ESTABLISHING JOB SHARING AS A PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT OPTION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	
	Summary of Findings	35
	Job Sharing as a Permanent Employment Alternative in DOE	36
	Eligibility Restrictions	41
	Collective Bargaining Considerations	46
	Effect on Retirement Benefits	49
	Teaching Conditions and Requirements	50
	Recruitment of New Hires	56
	Recommendations	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table		*Page*
2.1	Characteristics of Job Sharing Participants 1980–81 School Year	5
2.2	Division of Teaching Duties Between Job Sharers 1980–81 School year	6
3.1	Reasons for Participation in Pilot Project Tenured Teachers and New Hires	10
3.2	Equality of the Division of Responsibilities Between Job Sharers	11
3.3	Benefits from Job Sharing Reported by Tenured Teachers, May 1980	13
3.4	Benefits from Job Sharing Reported by New Hires May 1980	14
3.5	Comparison of the Return Rates of Job Sharers for the 1979–80 and 1980–81 School Years	15
3.6	Job Sharers 1979–80 School Year, Reasons for Termination of Participation in Pilot Project	16
3.7	Attitudes of School Administrators and Colleagues Toward Job Sharing as Perceived by Job Sharers	18
3.8	Support of School Administrators and Colleagues as Rated by Job Sharers	18
3.9	Change in Job Satisfaction of Tenured Teachers	19
3.10	Productivity of Tenured Teachers as Described by Tenured Teachers and Their Principals	20
3.11	Effect of Job Sharing on Quality of Education for Students	23

Table		*Page*
4.1	Comparison of Salary Costs	28
4.2	A Comparison of Costs of State Contributions to the Retirement System	28
4.3	A Comparison of Costs of State Contributions for Social Security	29
4.4	A Comparison of Costs of State Contributions for Medical Plans	29
4.5	A Comparison of Costs of State Contributions for Dental Plans	29
4.6	A Comparison of Costs of State Contributions for Group Life Insurance Plans	30
4.7	Direct Operating Costs, Job Sharing Pilot Project Costs vs. Costs Without Project	31
4.8	Estimated Administrative Costs, Job Sharing In-Kind Salary Contributions February 1978 to October 1979 and February 1980 to October 1980	32
5.1	Principals Involved in Pilot Project: Their Feelings About the Establishment of Job Sharing as a Permanent Employment Option in the Department of Education	37
5.2	Partial Day Compensation Schedule for Substitute Teachers	53

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Job sharing is generally defined as the sharing of a permanent, full-time position by two or more persons on a regular basis. In 1978, the Hawaii State Legislature, through the passage of Act 150, established a three-year pilot project in the Department of Education (DOE) to test the feasibility of job sharing as an employment alternative for classroom teachers. In 1980, the Legislature, with the enactment of Act 134, extended eligibility for participation in the pilot project to all tenured, certificated DOE personnel with the exception of educational officers.

Section 4 of Act 150 directs the Office of the Legislative Auditor to monitor and evaluate the pilot project and to present its findings and recommendations to the Legislature in a series of status reports. Accordingly, two such reports have been submitted to the 1979 and 1980 legislative sessions. This report is the third of the required reports. It presents the results of our final evaluation of the pilot project.

Objectives of the Evaluation

The objectives of this evaluation are as follows:

- To assess the effectiveness of the job sharing pilot project.
- To determine the cost of the job sharing program.
- To analyze job sharing as a permanent employment option in DOE and to identify the issues requiring resolution if the Legislature decides to make the program permanent.

Scope of the Evaluation

This report reviews the development and implementation of the job sharing pilot project by DOE from January 1979 through the current 1980–81 school year. The evaluation focuses on the extent to which the pilot project has demonstrated the feasibility of job sharing in DOE. It includes an assessment of the effectiveness of the project in attaining program objectives and an examination of the costs incurred by the project. It also analyzes job sharing as a permanent employment option and the issues relating to job sharing.

Evaluation Methodology

To gather data for the evaluation, we interviewed or surveyed 217 teachers who have participated in the pilot project. Also interviewed were the respective principals of the participating teachers, DOE state and district personnel involved in the administration of the project, and representatives from the collective bargaining units of the employees involved. We again surveyed the parents of a randomly selected sample of elementary students who

were being taught by job sharers and had been interviewed for our March 1980 evaluation report.

We also randomly sampled and surveyed 928 certificated DOE personnel and 337 teacher applicants who are seeking employment with DOE. This was done to assess existing interest in job sharing and to determine whether there would be a potential for broader participation if job sharing were to be established as a permanent employment option.

Questionnaires were also sent to 184 principals who did not have any job sharing teams in their schools to determine what interest, if any, there was in job sharing in their schools and to solicit their opinions and concerns about the program.

Basic data on the job sharing pilot project were compiled from the initial implementation of the project in January 1979 through November of the 1980–81 school year. Personnel and fiscal data were obtained from the DOE Office of Personnel Services. Information relating to employment taxes, fringe benefits, and the retirement system was provided by other appropriate state agencies.

Organization of the Report

This report is organized in five chapters. Chapter 1 is this introduction. Chapter 2 presents some background on the job sharing pilot project and demographic characteristics of the participants. Chapter 3 evaluates the effectiveness of the job sharing pilot project in achieving its objectives. Chapter 4 reviews program costs. Chapter 5 analyzes the alternative of establishing job sharing as a permanent employment option in DOE and identifies the issues related to the alternative.

Terminology

Throughout this report, we use the term "job sharers" to mean collectively all teachers participating in the pilot project, i.e., the tenured teachers as well as their newly hired counterparts.

The term "tenured teacher," unless otherwise noted, refers to the classroom tenured teacher who is participating in the pilot project.

The term "new hire" refers to the non-tenured, new teacher who is participating in the pilot project.

The term "certificated DOE personnel," unless otherwise noted, refers to all full-time, tenured, certificated personnel of DOE, who are under the same salary schedule. It specifically excludes all educational officers.

The term "March 1980 evaluation report" refers to Report No. 80–10, entitled *Evaluation of the Job Sharing Pilot Project in the Department of Education*, which was submitted to the Legislature of the State of Hawaii by the Legislative Auditor in March 1980.

CHAPTER 2

SOME BACKGROUND

Some people prefer to have more time for leisure and their own personal needs rather than added income. For many of these people, the traditional 40-hour workweek may not be necessary or desirable, and a more flexible work schedule would be preferable. This need, together with the sizable number of trained persons who are unable to enter the already crowded labor market in their chosen fields, has led to the idea of job sharing as a possible career option. Thus, job sharing has evolved from the 1960s as a viable means of increasing the opportunities for career part-time employment.

In an effort to increase the availability of flexible employment opportunities, the State Legislature introduced the concept of job sharing to the public sector in 1978, with the passage of Act 150, Session Laws of Hawaii. Section 3(5) of the act defines job sharing as "the voluntary sharing of a full-time employee's position with another employee, with each working one-half of the total number of hours of work required per week, and with each receiving half of the salary to which each is respectively entitled and at least half of each employee benefit afforded to full-time employees." This act established a three-year pilot project in the Department of Education (DOE) and provided for the conversion of a maximum of 100 full-time classroom teaching positions to job sharing positions with no more than 5 percent of the eligible faculty at any one school participating at any given time.

In the regular session of 1980, the Legislature amended Act 150 by removing two restrictions placed on the project. It removed the stipulation that participation in the pilot project be restricted to classroom teachers and thus provided for participation by other certificated DOE personnel. It also lifted the restriction limiting participation in the pilot project to only 5 percent of the eligible personnel at any one school.

This chapter reviews the development and implementation of the pilot project in DOE and reports on the demographic characteristics of the project participants and the manner in which jobs have been shared.

Present Size of the Pilot Project

The job sharing pilot project was launched at the beginning of the second semester of the 1978–79 school year. At that time, the first group of 20 tenured teachers and their newly hired counterparts began work as job sharers. During the first half of the 1979–80 school year, the total number of job sharing teams was 50 positions, an increase of 30 positions over the previous semester's total. A number of changes did occur during the second semester of the 1979–80 school year, bringing the total number of teams at the end of the school year to 52.

The job sharing pilot project is now in its third and final test year. While participation

has been extended to other certificated DOE personnel this year, applications for job sharing positions have been received only from classroom teachers. Still, participation in the pilot project has climbed since the 1979 spring semester. Going into the 1980–81 school year, there were 66 job sharing teams.

Demographic Characteristics of Job Sharers

As required by Act 150, we report in this section on the demographic characteristics of the 132 job sharers participating in the pilot project during the 1980–81 school year.

Geographic distribution. All seven DOE districts are represented in this third year group of 66 job sharing teams, just as they were in the second semester of 1979 and the ensuing school year. Table 2.1 shows their location by district and school. Forty-four schools are represented in the pilot project, including 13 new participating schools. Of the 43 schools involved in the pilot project for the 1979–80 school year, 13 no longer have any job sharing teams.

Grade level and subject matter distribution. As shown in Table 2.1, of the 66 job sharing positions, 30 (46 percent) are at the elementary school level, 28.5 (43 percent) at the high school level, and 7.5 (11 percent) at the intermediate school level. The two halves represent a team that teaches students in the seventh grade as well as in grades 11 and 12.

The distribution pattern of the current group of job sharers by grade level and subject matter is quite similar to that of the two previous groups of job sharers. At the secondary level, the distribution of subject areas is widely dispersed, with no discipline showing a preponderence of participants.

Distribution by sex. Of the 66 tenured teachers, 62 are female and 4 are male. Of their new-hire counterparts, 57 are female and 9 are male. This predominance of female participation has been the pattern since the beginning of the pilot project.

Distribution by age. The age levels of both groups of job sharers participating in the 1980–81 school year fall into definite patterns, as shown in Table 2.1. The tenured teachers are heavily grouped in the 30–39 age bracket, whereas, 31 of the new hires fall in the 20–29 age bracket, and 26 in the 30–39 age bracket. These patterns are essentially the same as those of the 1979 spring semester and the 1979–80 school year groups of job sharers. Although it was initially believed that tenured teachers close to retirement would be interested in job sharing, only one tenured teacher in the 60-plus bracket is currently participating in the pilot project.

Distribution by ethnic background. DOE is required to record the ethnic background of all applicants for employment. Table 2.1 displays the distribution by ethnic background of both the tenured teachers and the new hires.

Distribution by length of service. Table 2.1 shows the number of years the 66 tenured teachers have been employed by DOE. As with teachers in the two previous school years, they are concentrated in two groups: 6–10 years of service, 30; and 11–15 years, 23.

Manner in Which Jobs Are Shared

The tenured teacher is responsible for proposing how a job is to be shared. A proposed work schedule outlining times, teaching responsibilities, and other school-related responsibilities is submitted to the principal for approval. Upon approval, the full-time position is converted to a job sharing position, and a new hire is recruited. The following is a summary of the work schedules which have been submitted and approved for the 1980–81 school year.

Teaching duties. The full-time teaching schedule is divided in one of two ways: (1) both

TABLE 2.1

CHARACTERISTICS OF JOB SHARING PARTICIPANTS
1980–81 SCHOOL YEAR

Location of Positions by District and School

	No. of positions: School total	District total
Honolulu District		15
Ala Wai Elementary	1	
Farrington High	1	
Fern Elementary	1	
Kaiser High	6	
Kalani High	1	
Kapalama Elementary	2	
Waikiki Elementary	1	
Washington Intermediate	2	
Central District		15
Aiea High	2	
Hickam Elementary	1	
Kunia Elementary	1	
Leilehua High	1	
Makalapa Elementary	1	
Moanalua High	2	
Moanalua Intermediate	1	
Radford High	4	
Red Hill Elementary	2	
Leeward District		14
Campbell High	1	
Ewa Beach Elementary	2	
Ilima Intermediate	1	
Maili Elementary	1	
Makaha Elementary	1	
Pearl City High	3	
Waianae Intermediate	1	
Waipahu High	2	
Waipahu Intermediate	2	
Windward District		9
Ahuimanu Elementary	2	
Castle High	2	
Kalaheo High/Intermediate	1	
Lanikai Elementary	2	
Mokapu Elementary	1	
Waimanalo Elem/Inter	1	
Hawaii District		3
Kapiolani Elementary	1	
Keaiakeha Elementary	1	
Konawaena High/Inter	1	
Maui District		7
Baldwin High	1	
Haiku Elementary	1	
Kahului Elementary	1	
Lanai High/Elementary	1	
Pukalani Elementary	1	
Wailuku Elementary	2	
Kauai District		3
Kapaa Elementary	1	
Kapaa High/Inter	1	
Waimea Canyon Elem	1	

Grade Level and Subject Matter

	No. of positions
Elementary	30
Kindergarten	0
Grade 1	2½
Grade 2	7
Grade 3	2½
Grade 4	3
Grade 5	2
Grade 6	2
Elementary	2
Reading/Special Projects	8
Special Education	1
Intermediate (Grades 7 and 8)	7½
English	2
Math	1
Modern History/Hawaiiana/Social Studies	½
Physical Education	2
Science/Biology	1
Social Studies/Japanese	1
High School	28½
Biology/Science	1
Business Courses	2
English	4
French/Spanish	2
German/Spanish	1
Health	1
Home Economics	3
Japanese	2
Mathematics	2
Modern History/Hawaiiana/Social Studies	½
Physical Education	2
Psychology	1
Reading/Speech/English Literature	1
Remedial Reading	1
Social Studies	3
Social Studies/Japanese	1
Speech/English	1

Job Sharing, Tenured Teachers
Length of Service in DOE

No. of years	No. of participants
0 – 5	2
6 – 10	30
11 – 15	23
16 – 20	6
21 – 25	5
26 – 30	0

Age of Participants

Age groups	Tenured teachers	New hires
20 – 29	0	31
30 – 39	47	26
40 – 49	13	6
50 – 59	5	3
60+	1	0

Ethnic Background

Ethnic groups	Tenured teachers	New hires
Black	0	1
Chinese	6	3
Filipino	5	3
Japanese	30	34
Korean	2	0
Mixed	3	1
Part-Hawaiian	5	5
White	15	19

job sharers work five days a week, splitting the time the same way every day or with slight variations; or (2) each job sharer teaches full days but only for a portion of the five-day workweek. As shown by Table 2.2, 48 (73 percent) of the 66 tenured teachers proposed some form of the abbreviated five-day-week schedule, generally splitting the time by a half day apiece.

Table 2.2

Division of Teaching Duties Between Job Sharers 1980–81 School Year

Schedule	*Elementary*	*Secondary*
Five days per week:		
Tenured teacher in a.m.; new hire in p.m.; no overlap	1	13
Tenured teacher in a.m.; new hire in p.m.; with overlap	11	12
Tenured teacher in p.m.; new hire in a.m.; no overlap	5	2
Tenured teacher in p.m.; new hire in a.m.; with overlap	3	0
Tenured teacher in a.m. 2 days and 3 full days per week; new hire in a.m. 3 days and 2 full days per week	0	1
	20	28
Less than Five Days per Week		
Each teacher teaches 2 full days 1 week; 3 days the next	0	5
Each teacher teaches 2½ days per week	5	1
Tenured teacher on 2 days of the week; new hire on other 2 days, alternate Wednesdays (full day)	1	0
Tenured teacher on 2 days of the week; new hire on other 2 days; alternate Wednesdays (half day)	1	0
Each teacher teaches 3 days per week; with overlap 1 day	0	2
Tenured teacher in a.m. 4 days of the week and all day Wednesdays; new hire in p.m. 4 days of the week (off Wednesdays)	3	0
	10	8

Grading. At the secondary level, each member of a job sharing team is generally responsible for grading only the students that the member teaches. Of the 36 secondary level teams in the 1980–81 academic year, only one team grades differently. In this one instance, both members assign a separate grade to their students; then, the two grades are averaged out to yield one final grade that will show on the students' report cards.

The job sharing teams at the elementary level have slightly different kinds of arrangements, depending on the type of teaching schedule. The predominant arrangement is a self-contained class where both partners teach the same group of students for a half day, but each teacher is responsible for only some of the subjects. In 50 percent of the elementary level teams each teacher grades all the students in the class for only the subject areas for which the teacher is responsible. Some of these teams jointly evaluate behavior, work habits, and attitude of the students. In 27 percent of the elementary level teams, both teachers consult with each other and evaluate the students for all subject areas. In these cases coordination is necessary, mostly because both teachers work a full day on certain days of the week and teach all subject areas. For the remainder of the elementary level job sharing teams, either each teacher has different groups of students and grades the respective students, or no grading is required for the particular program.

Parent–teacher conferences. Generally, the secondary teachers confer only with parents of students in their respective classes. However, there are two teams where both job sharers confer with parents together. On the other hand, more elementary level teachers tend to share the responsibility of parent–teacher conferences. In 67 percent of the teams, where the teachers share a class, both or either one of the teachers are available for conferences with the parents of all students. In other cases, where teachers are responsible for different groups of students, they confer with parents of students in their respective groups.

Extracurricular activities. The teachers generally share the responsibilities for extracurricular activities. However, a few of the tenured teachers assume complete responsibility for them.

Lesson plans. Generally, lesson planning for the classes is the responsibility of each individual job sharer at the elementary as well as at the secondary level. However, more elementary teachers than secondary teachers indicate that they coordinate their lesson plans with their partners.

Committee responsibilities. Responsibility for work on a committee is generally shared by the job sharing members at both the elementary and secondary levels. However, 16 tenured teachers assume responsibility for all committee assignments, and two at the elementary level assign their new hire counterparts full responsibility.

Campus supervision. Campus supervision responsibilities are mostly shared by both teachers on the team. Whoever is on duty on the particular day or at the particular time assumes the assigned responsibility. Only three teachers indicate that their new hire counterparts are fully responsible.

Faculty meetings. In some instances, attendance at faculty meetings is the responsibility of both members of a job sharing team. In other instances, the person who is at work at the time or on the day of the meeting attends. Some tenured teachers assume full responsibility for attending faculty meetings or for getting all the information disseminated at those meetings they do not attend.

Summary

During the three-year test period, 109 tenured teachers and 108 new hires have participated in the pilot project. For the three-year pilot test period, several trends can be discerned. Most job sharers, tenured teachers as well as new hires, are females. Although the tenured teachers tend to be older than new hires, most of the tenured teachers appear to be among the younger DOE teachers. Very few tenured teachers near retirement, either by age or length of service, have opted to participate in the pilot project.

CHAPTER 3

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

The effectiveness of the job sharing program may be determined by assessing the extent to which the objectives of the program have been achieved. As summarized from Act 150, the objectives of the job sharing program are as follows:

- To offer an alternative employment option to teachers.
- To provide more employment opportunities for the disproportionate numbers of unemployed teachers in the State.
- To create more stimulating environments for tenured teachers in their professional capacities.
- To provide additional educational stimulus for students.

Initial findings on the effectiveness of the pilot project in achieving these program objectives were presented in our March 1980 evaluation report. The findings, at that time, had been derived from data compiled from the project's initial implementation in January 1979 through February of the 1979–80 school year. In this chapter, we review those findings and compare them with the findings resulting from our evaluation of the implementation of the pilot project from the second semester of the 1979–80 school year through the 1980–81 school year.

Summary of Findings

The March 1980 evaluation found the pilot project to be generally effective in achieving program objectives. The subsequent evaluation of the project conducted at the end of the 1979–80 school year and during the first semester of the 1980–81 school year confirms the continuing effectiveness of the pilot project in meeting program objectives. Specifically, we find that:

1. Job sharing continues to be a feasible and desired employment option for teachers.

2. Job sharing continues to increase the number of available teaching positions for unemployed teachers as well as provide them with more meaningful employment opportunities. However, its actual impact in reducing the large number of teacher applicants seeking positions in the Department of Education (DOE) continues to be minimal.

3. Job sharing continues to create a more stimulating environment for tenured teachers in their professional capacities. Tenured teachers consistently report an increase in job satisfaction, work productivity, and quality of work.

4. Although conclusive evidence is lacking to support the expectation that job sharing would provide additional educational stimulus for students, the pilot project appears to have a

positive effect on the quality of education provided. Parents, job sharers, and principals generally remain satisfied with the quality of education provided under the pilot project.

Alternative Employment Option

In our March 1980 evaluation report, we examined the extent to which the pilot project had met the objective of providing an alternative employment option for teachers. To make this determination, we assessed the following areas: (1) the extent to which there is a need for an alternative employment option; (2) the feasibility of sharing classroom teaching positions; (3) the number of project participants; and (4) the desirability of job sharing as an alternative employment option. The conclusion was reached that job sharing was a feasible and desired employment option for teachers. In this section, we use the same criteria to reexamine the pilot project and determine if the previously drawn conclusion continues to be valid.

Need for alternative employment option. Participation in job sharing is strictly voluntary, both for the tenured teachers and new hires. Therefore, all job sharers have specific reasons for choosing to participate in the pilot project. As discussed in the March 1980 evaluation report, the majority of tenured teachers interviewed stated that their motivation for participating in the pilot project was to increase the amount of time they could spend with their own families while the vast majority of new hires chose to job share simply because it was the only way they were able to obtain a regular teaching position. As shown in Table 3.1, a survey of job sharers participating in the pilot project for the first time either during the second semester of the 1979–80 school year or the 1980–81 school year yields similar results. It is again apparent that there is a distinct difference between the motivations of tenured teachers and new hires participating in the pilot project.

A comparison of the types of reasons expressed by the two groups of job sharers for their participation in the pilot project reveals similar trends. Again, most tenured teachers want to have more time with their families, but are either unable financially or unwilling to relinquish their teaching positions completely.

While the foremost reason for the new hires' participation in the pilot project continues to be their desire to have the opportunity to teach on a regular basis, Table 3.1 also discloses that there

Table 3.1

Reasons for Participation in Pilot Project
Tenured Teachers and New Hires

	Tenured teachers		*New hires*	
	1/79–12/79	*"New" participants 1/80–10/80*	*1/79–12/79*	*"New" participants 1/80–10/80*
Opportunity to teach			77%	60%
More time for family	51%	50%	8	22
Health reasons; physical and mental	12	14		
Explore other jobs	12	10		
More time for personal needs	10	15		2
Time for professional improvement	10	5		5
Want part-time job	3	3	15	11
Provide opportunity for another teacher	2			
Too much violence in school environment		3		

is an increase in the percentage of new hires who job share because they, like the majority of participating tenured teachers, want to have more time for their families. Thus, even if most of the new hires continue to view job sharing as more of a necessity rather than a preferred choice, there are some new hires who are specifically seeking part-time teaching positions and consequently regard job sharing as a good employment option.

Feasibility of sharing classroom positions. The general guideline used in dividing the full-time position between job sharers is that each job sharer works one half of the total number of hours required per week of the full-time position and performs one half of the work responsibilities. The tenured teacher is responsible for proposing a work schedule to the principal. Upon approval of the work schedule, a new hire is recruited for the vacant half position.

As found in the previous evaluation of the pilot project, most tenured teachers continue to experience little, if any, difficulty in developing work schedules which allot three and a half hours of school for each teacher. Only two elementary teachers job sharing for the first time in the 1980–81 school year reported having experienced some problems in dividing the instructional portion of the workday. At the secondary level, there was one case of initial disagreement between teacher and principal over the proposed work schedule, but agreement was reached.

The March 1980 evaluation report noted that the majority of principals did not feel that the conversion of the full-time position to job sharing was difficult. A survey of principals experiencing job sharing for the first time in their schools confirms this finding. The majority of these principals characterized the conversion process as being easier than they had originally anticipated or indicated that no problems were encountered. Only five principals did feel that the conversion process was more difficult than they had anticipated. Six others reported having had some problems but were able to resolve them easily. The most common problem in the conversion process continues to be accommodating the teachers' needs and work schedule within the school's schedule. There was some difficulty when the principals felt that both sharers should attend faculty meetings or when the school's schedule was not particularly conducive to even splits of work schedule.

In the March 1980 evaluation report, the responses of job sharers and their principals relating to the equality of the division of responsibilities were discussed. After a complete school year of job sharing, the same individuals were again asked whether job responsibilities had been equally divided between job sharers. The results of this second survey are compared in Table 3.2 to those obtained at the beginning of the school year.

Table 3.2

Equality of the Division of Responsibilities Between Job Sharers

	Tenured teachers		*New hires*		*Principals*	
Response	*1st survey*	*2nd survey*	*1st survey*	*2nd survey*	*1st survey*	*2nd survey*
Equal	88%	86%	89%	90%	85%	92%
Not Equal ..	12	8	11	8	13	8
Uncertain ..	–	6	–	2	2	–

As shown by Table 3.2, the results of the two surveys are very similar. In each group, the overwhelming majority continue to feel that the responsibilities had been evenly divided between job sharers. However, there were some tenured teachers and new hires who did not feel this way. Several tenured teachers reported having to assume most of the planning and clerical responsibilities although the instructional time was equitable. Most of the inequities appear to center around noninstructional areas such as attendance at faculty meetings, conferences, and extracurricular activities.

The results of a third survey conducted early in the 1980–81 school year further confirms the

finding that in the vast majority of job sharing teams, the responsibilities are being divided equally. Of the tenured teachers surveyed, 92 percent feel that the division of responsibilities is equal as do 88 percent of the new hires, and 88 percent of the principals.

Number of project participants. Another measure of teacher reaction to job sharing as an alternate employment option is the extent to which maximum use has been made of the 100 positions allotted to the pilot project. For both the 1979 spring semester and the 1979–80 school year, the number of participating tenured teachers had been far less than 100. Therefore, as one way of maximizing the use of the 100 positions during the pilot project test period, the Legislature during its 1980 regular session passed Act 134, which removed the restriction limiting eligibility for the pilot project to only classroom teachers, thereby enabling such other school certificated personnel as counselors, librarians, registrars, and resource teachers to participate in the project. It also removed the restriction which limited participation in the pilot project to no more than 5 percent of the eligible faculty at any school. However, even with the removal of these two restrictions, the job sharing positions for the 1980–81 school year number 66, more than before but less than the maximum allotted 100 positions.

Although inquiries relating to the pilot project had been received from certificated DOE personnel other than classroom teachers, there were no applicants. One of the reasons for this may be because the act allowing their participation was approved in late May 1980, and there may not have been enough time for people to readjust plans already made for the next school year. There are, however, six schools where the number of job sharing positions exceeds 5 percent of the individual school's faculty. In one instance, a secondary school with six job sharing teams would have been limited to only four teams had the 5 percent quota not been removed.

Despite the limited number of project participants, there are indications that interest in job sharing continues to grow. There were eight other tenured teachers who applied for job sharing positions for the 1980–81 school year but were unable to be accommodated as qualified new hires could not be found. In at least two cases, tenured teachers were discouraged from applying for job sharing positions by principals whose attitude and support towards the pilot project were negative. In addition, a survey of all principals whose schools were without job sharing teams during the 1979–80 school year revealed that at least three applications had been rejected. As the number of participants has steadily increased, the possibility remains that the number of tenured teachers wanting to job share would increase if the program is made permanent.

Job sharing as a desired alternative employment option. In this section, we reexamine the desirability of job sharing as an alternative employment option for teachers, i.e., whether it is worth implementing because of certain resultant benefits or advantages. In making the initial determination for the March 1980 evaluation report, we secured the overall impressions of the pilot project of the individuals who were involved with job sharing at the school, district, or state levels. At that time, nearly all of the individuals interviewed rated job sharing as "excellent" or "good." Surveys taken at the end of the 1979–80 school year and the beginning of the 1980–81 school year show that the pilot project continues to receive high marks.

Tenured teachers. As previously discussed, the tenured teachers who job share do so for specific reasons. Thus, it is not surprising that all of the tenured teachers responding to the survey at the end of the 1979–80 school year rated job sharing as an "excellent" employment option. In all cases, except one, the tenured teachers felt that participation in the pilot project enabled them to fulfill their personal objectives. These tenured teachers report that they continued to receive the same benefits which they cited at the beginning of the school year. For many of them, an important benefit is that they are able to spend more time with their families and in

meeting various family needs or obligations. Many tenured teachers feel that they have become better teachers because of the decrease in teaching responsibilities and/or students and the corresponding lessening of stress and pressures. They report that they are more refreshed, more energetic, and happier in the classrooms and are consequently able to do more for their students. Others have found that they are able to use the resulting extra time to develop new hobbies, expand personal interests, become more involved with community activities, or pursue professional improvement courses. A listing of these benefits and their ranking according to the number of times they have been cited by these teachers is provided in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3

Benefits from Job Sharing Reported by Tenured Teachers May 1980

Benefits	*Number of times cited*
More time for family and family needs	22
Becoming a better teacher (decrease in workload; better attitude towards teaching – more time for lesson preparation and individualization)	16
More time for personal needs; other interests	12
Improved mental health; less stress	9
Improved physical health; time for health treatments	7
Time for professional improvement courses	3

All of the tenured teachers responding in the third survey early in the 1980–81 school year rate job sharing as either "excellent" or "good." They continue to identify the same types of benefits previously reported by other tenured teachers in the pilot project. Again, as with the other tenured teachers, the benefit cited most frequently by this group of tenured teachers is that of having extra time to spend with their families or to fulfill family responsibilities. Many specifically comment that participation in the pilot project has greatly reduced physical and mental fatigue which, in turn, results in quality time for their students, families, and themselves. The overall feeling continues to be that job sharing results in an improved and more enthusiastic attitude towards teaching.

New hires. At the end of the 1979–80 school year, the new hires continued to rate job sharing slightly lower than the tenured teachers. Again, this is not totally unexpected since the majority of them prefer full-time positions and accept job sharing positions more out of necessity. However, all of the new hires responding to the survey report that job sharing did provide them with what they wanted. As they had reported at the beginning of the 1979–80 school year, the majority of new hires cite the opportunity to teach and gain professional experience as being the main benefit of job sharing. For some new hires, the pilot project provided them with their first regular teaching position. Many remarked that they were able to share ideas with and learn from their more experienced tenured teacher partners. Job sharing also enabled some new hires to reenter the teaching profession after having been absent for several years. Like the tenured teachers, the new hires reported that they have more time for family needs, personal needs, and other interests. Others mentioned that the decrease in teaching responsibilities enabled them to give more and better preparation for their lessons and respond more to the individual needs of the students. Perhaps the feelings of most new hires are best summarized by a teacher who responded to the question about the types of benefits gained by job sharing by writing the following:

> "Being able to teach as a regular teacher than a tutor. The job is very challenging and exciting. I had time to do other things, yet still participate in my first love–teaching. Sharing of ideas with tenured teacher. Much broadening of experiences and knowledge. I like being able to accumulate sick leave and have retirement benefits. I also like having the opportunity to receive credit for years of service."

Table 3.4 lists the benefits of job sharing ranked according to the number of times reported by new hires.

Table 3.4

Benefits from Job Sharing
Reported by New Hires
May 1980

Benefits	*Number of times cited*
Opportunity to teach; gain teaching experience and skills	18
Less workload; more time for lesson preparation and good introduction to teaching and DOE	12
More time for family and family needs	11
More time for personal needs; other interests	6
Share ideas with, learn from tenured teacher partner	6
Regular, steady employment	5
Mental and physical health benefits	3
Fringe benefits	2
Time for professional improvement courses	2

Approximately 95 percent of the new hires in the third survey conducted in the 1980–81 school year, rate job sharing as "excellent" or "good." As with the new hires in the previous surveys, these new hires list the opportunity to teach and gain experience and skills as the most important benefit of job sharing. Although most still prefer a full-time position, they agree that job sharing is much better than substituting. Again, the benefits reported by these new hires fall into the same categories listed in Table 3.4.

Principals. As discussed in the March 1980 evaluation report, most principals base their feelings about the desirability of job sharing as an alternative employment option for teachers on the success or failure of job sharing teams in their own schools. Accordingly, they stress that the advantages gained from the pilot project are attributable to the dedication, strengths, and professionalism of the individual job sharers.

At the end of the 1979–80 school year, 92 percent of the principals involved with the pilot project rated job sharing as being either an "excellent" or a "good" employment option. Generally, most principals felt that the pilot project resulted in specific benefits for the job sharers and the schools. One principal who felt that the pilot project was very successful admitted that initially he was quite apprehensive, particularly about its effect on the students. However, he noted that both teachers worked well together and his fears proved to be unfounded.

The principals particularly support the voluntary nature of the program and their authority to accept, reject, or request modifications to the job sharing proposals submitted by the tenured teachers. They comment that not all teachers are suited to job sharing and they must also weigh the effects of the proposal on the needs of the school and students. Secondary principals indicated that the extra class section gained by having job sharers teach three classes resulted in lowering class ratios and leveling the workloads among all teachers in a particular department. Several principals also commented on another aspect of job sharing–that of having an alternative to suggest to teachers whom they were counseling to either take leave to pursue professional improvement courses or do something other than teaching. They explained that it is especially hard to terminate a teacher who is really good but just "burnt out."

While most principals agreed that advantages resulting from job sharing outweighed its shortcomings, there were a number of difficulties and minor problems. They cautioned that the success or failure of the job sharing team depended on selecting a new hire who is not only competent but compatible with the tenured teacher. If both teachers cooperated and worked well together, minimal extra work was required of the principal. Some job sharing teams did run into some difficulty because of the teachers' conflicting styles of disciplining students or different expectations. The primary complaint from the principals centered around the recruitment and selection of new hires. Both they and their clerical staff experienced considerable difficulty in finding qualified new hires just to interview as the lists of applicants

forwarded were outdated and not prescreened as to the actual interests of the applicants in job sharing. Generally, however, after the teams were selected, most principals and their staffs felt that the additional work was manageable.

A survey of principals experiencing job sharing for the first time during the 1980–81 school year confirms the findings from the first two surveys. All but three of these principals give job sharing either an "excellent" or a "good" rating. Most principals feel that the job sharers are happier and better prepared for their lessons. A few point out that the job sharers appear to have to work harder to avoid being unfavorably compared by their shared students. The principals strongly support the flexibility of establishing teaching schedules to meet the needs of the students and the schools as well as those of the job sharers. Several principals acknowledge that the opportunity to hire a new teacher whose teaching strengths would complement those of the tenured teacher is another attractive feature of job sharing.

DOE administrators. The overall feeling of most DOE administrators at the district and state levels is that the job sharing pilot project is a good program which has been implemented without too much difficulty. They feel that one of the primary advantages of job sharing is that it creates more employment opportunities and options for the new hires and tenured teachers without adversely affecting the quality of education provided. The schools and students seem to benefit from the new talents and skills brought in by the new hires as well as from the increased efforts of the tenured teachers who are happier and more satisfied with teaching.

It appears that the DOE administrators regard the recruitment and selection of new hires as the principal problem relating to job sharing. Difficulties have been experienced in getting new hires for certain jobs or locations or for replacement of another new hire who quits before the contract period. One district personnel officer notes that although there are large numbers of unemployed teachers seeking positions with DOE, it is often difficult to pair the specific specialties. For example, there is a shortage of math and science teachers, so there is some difficulty in finding a new hire willing to job share with a tenured teacher in either of these fields. Other administrators caution that, while most job sharing requests have been fulfilled, in the future, if the employment market changes and there is a shortage of teachers who are willing to work part-time, DOE may not be able to accommodate as many tenured teachers who want to job share.

Return rate of job sharers. The contracts for job sharing positions do not extend beyond one school year. Teachers who wish to continue in the pilot project must reapply for the job sharing positions. Therefore, another measure which can be used to test the desirability of job sharing as an alternative employment option for teachers is the return rate of job sharers. The March 1980 evaluation report disclosed that the return rate for the 1979 spring semester job sharers in the 1979–80 school year was an overall 50 percent. The return rate for the 1979–80 school year job sharers in the 1980–81 school year is 48 percent, about the same as the preceding school year as shown in Table 3.5. In addition to the 28 tenured teachers who job shared in the 1979–80 school year and chose to continue in the pilot project in 1980–81, there are four tenured teachers who participated in the pilot project during only the 1979 spring semester and returned to participate again during the current school year.

Table 3.5

Comparison of the Return Rates of Job Sharers for the 1979–80 and 1980–81 School Years

	Tenured teachers		*New hires*		*Total*	
	No.	*Percent*	*No.*	*Percent*	*No.*	*Percent*
Continuation in 1979–80 school year . .	11	55%	9	45%	20	50%
Continuation in 1980–81 school year . .	28	51	25	45	53	48

Twenty-seven tenured teachers and 31 new hires decided to terminate participation in the pilot project after the 1979–80 school year. The reasons for their termination are presented in Table 3.6. As in the March 1980 evaluation report, the reason cited by most tenured teachers for not continuing to job share is that they are unable to afford the reduction in salary. Again, as in the March 1980 evaluation report, the foremost reason cited by the new hires for their leaving the pilot project is that they have been offered a full-time position. In fact, two of them terminated their job sharing positions mid-year when they were given the opportunity to replace their tenured teacher partners who were going on leave. The two new hires who indicated that they were not satisfied with job sharing based their objections on the lack of probationary credit or tenure and the small amount of compensation for the amount of time that was expended. However, even among those who chose not to participate in the pilot project for the 1980–81 school year, a majority of both tenured teachers and new hires indicated that they would apply for a job sharing position in the future if the program is established on a permanent basis.

Table 3.6

Job Sharers 1979–80 School Year
Reasons for Termination
Of Participation in Pilot Project

Reason	*Tenured teachers*	*New hires*
Economic considerations	8	1
Received a full-time position	–	12
Partner decided to discontinue	–	6
Wanted to return to full-time	4	–
Not offered position	–	3
Not satisfied with job sharing	–	2
Not satisfied with partner/ inexperienced new hire	2	–
Lack of seniority; same teaching line unavailable	2	–
No qualified partner	1	–
Wanted to teach at another level	–	1
Received permanent half-time position	–	1
Waiting for full-time position	–	1
Administrative reservations	2	–
Staying at home because of family	4	1
Other personal reasons	4	–
No response or unavailable	–	3
Total	27	31

Employment Opportunities for Unemployed Teachers

After more than 20 years of growth, student enrollment in Hawaii's public schools has been declining since the 1972–73 school year. As a result, there is a large surplus of teachers in the State. For the 1980–81 school year, the DOE has on file approximately 3370 applications from teachers seeking positions.

Impact on teacher surplus in the State. From its implementation in the schools in the 1979 spring semester through the end of the 1979–80 school year, the pilot project has provided 67 teacher applicants with jobs. With an additional 41 having been recruited for the first time this school year, a total of 108 individuals have chosen to accept new hire positions in the job sharing project thus far. In view of the substantial teacher surplus in the State, the hiring of 108 individuals is not very significant in the aggregate. However, as noted previously, job sharing appears to be the only way for many of the new hires to obtain regular teaching positions in DOE.

Employment status of new hires. Until they are able to secure full-time teaching positions, most teacher applicants are forced to seek other means of employment. As reported in the March 1980 evaluation report, our survey of new hires disclosed that 84 percent of the new hires had been employed prior to their participation and 16 percent were either unemployed or not in the labor force. A survey of the new hires participating in the pilot project for the first time in the 1980–81 school year reveals a similar pattern. Eighty-five percent of the new hires in our current survey had been employed prior to their participation in the pilot project while the remaining 15 percent were either unemployed or not in the labor force. Of those employed, 76

percent were actually employed in teaching positions as were 68 percent in the previous survey. However, these teachers were primarily working on special projects, tutoring, or substituting either daily or on a long-term basis.

Interest in job sharing. Although most teacher applicants seek full-time employment, there are some who prefer part-time employment. When given the choice of a full-time or a part-time position, 33 percent of the new hires maintain, as did 36 percent of the new hires in our previous survey, that their first preference is to teach on a part-time basis. These teachers generally place great emphasis on spending time with their families even though they all appear to want to pursue a teaching career. More often than not, they have young children. For these individuals, job sharing is advantageous, for it allows them to teach as well as to devote time to their home life.

Lead to full-time employment. Participation in the pilot project does not confer tenure or probationary status on the new hire, and the new hire has no guarantee of a job sharing position for the next school year. However, it appears that many new hires are willing to take the position because they feel that it may lead to a full-time job. Seventy-six percent of the new hires in our current survey, as compared to 71 percent last year, feel that job sharing might lead to a full-time teaching position. They continue to hope that the foothold they have managed to obtain by job sharing will somehow open other avenues for them to secure a full-time teaching job.

For some, participation in the pilot project may lead to better teaching opportunities. As with the first group of 1979 spring semester new hires, there were a number of new hires among the 56 who participated in the 1979–80 school year who did find full-time teaching positions. Twelve new hires found full-time teaching positions with DOE. Another new hire accepted a part-time teaching position with DOE, but the position, unlike the job sharing position, is a permanent one. There are three others who have teaching positions, one at Kapiolani Community College, one at a private school, and the remaining one at a community night school.

Stimulating Environments for Tenured Teachers

One of the objectives of Act 150 is for job sharing to create more stimulating environments for tenured teachers. In the March 1980 evaluation report, we examined such measures as job satisfaction, work productivity, and quality of work of the tenured teachers to determine the extent to which the pilot project was meeting this objective. The results of that examination found the pilot project to be generally effective in creating more stimulating environments for tenured teachers. Surveys of job sharers and their principals conducted at the end of the 1979–80 school year and the beginning of the 1980–81 school year confirm the March 1980 finding.

Job satisfaction. One of the measures used to assess the effects of job sharing on the teaching environment is the extent to which tenured teachers express satisfaction with their jobs. The underlying assumption is that a person who works in a stimulating environment is apt to be happier and more fulfilled professionally than someone whose working conditions have become routine or stressful. In the March 1980 evaluation report, we examined certain indices to determine job satisfaction of tenured teachers participating in the pilot project: compatibility between job sharers, the attitudes of other school personnel toward job sharing, and the support extended to job sharers by other personnel. In this section, we review the findings relating to these indices and compare them with the findings of examinations of the same indices which were conducted at (1) the end of the 1979–80 school year, and (2) the beginning of the 1980–81 school year.

Compatibility between job sharers. In our March 1980 report, we found that a majority of job sharers, especially at the elementary level, felt that compatibility between partners was important in their particular teaching situations.

At the time of the first survey, 98 percent of the tenured teachers and new hires felt that they had an "excellent" or a "good" working relationship with their partners. The survey at the end of the 1979–80 school year shows that the job sharers continue to be compatible and enjoy excellent working relationships. Approximately 94 percent of the tenured teachers and 95 percent of the new hires rated their working relationship as "excellent" or "good." That the job sharers worked well together is confirmed by their principals, 95 percent of whom reported observing no problems or difficulties between the tenured teachers and new hires.

The third survey at the beginning of the 1980–81 school year shows that the job sharers continue to enjoy good working relationships. Ninety-seven percent of the tenured teachers describe their working relationship with their new hire partners as being either "excellent" or "good," while 93 percent of the new hires report feeling this way. Most principals also report that they are unaware of any problems surfacing between the job sharers.

Attitudes of other school personnel. The attitudes of their school administrators and colleagues toward job sharing may also affect the job sharers' satisfaction with their jobs. We again surveyed the tenured teachers and new hires to determine their perceptions of the attitudes of their school administrators and colleagues. As shown in Table 3.7, the results of this survey at the end of the 1979–80 school year validate the findings of the survey conducted earlier in the same school year.

Table 3.7

Attitudes of School Administrators and Colleagues Toward Job Sharing as Perceived by Job Sharers

	School administrators		*Colleagues*	
Perceived attitudes	*Job sharer responses*		*Job sharer responses*	
	1st survey	*2nd survey*	*1st survey*	*2nd survey*
Positive	79%	82%	80%	82%
Negative ...	2	–	1	1
Neutral	11	8	8	10
Uncertain ..	8	10	11	7

The majority of job sharers thought that the school administrators had positive attitudes towards job sharing. They also felt that their colleagues had positive feelings about the pilot project. A few reported that other teachers not participating in the pilot project often expressed the wish that they too could job share.

Support of other school personnel. In the March 1980 evaluation report, we presented the responses of the job sharers who had been asked to rate the quality of support of school administrators and colleagues of their participation in the pilot project. At the end of the 1979–80 school year, the job sharers were again asked to respond to the same question. As shown in Table 3.8, the results of this second survey correlate with the results of the first survey.

Table 3.8

Support of School Administrators and Colleagues As Rated by Job Sharers

	School administrators		*Colleagues*	
Rating of support received	*Job sharer responses*		*Job sharer responses*	
	1st survey	*2nd survey*	*1st survey*	*2nd survey*
Excellent ...	55%	70%	55%	62%
Good	38	22	43	35
Fair	3	8	–	3
Poor	3	–	–	–
Neutral/ Uncertain..	1	–	2	–

The vast majority of job sharers indicated that they continued to receive excellent or good support for their participation in the pilot project throughout the school year. Several job sharers commented that their principals were totally supportive of the pilot project and made extra effort to accommodate them. Although 92 percent of the job sharers felt that the support extended to them by their school administrators was excellent or good, there were a few who maintained that their particular principals were less than enthusiastic about the pilot project. The job sharers again rate the support they received from their colleagues very highly, with 97 percent of them believing that

the support from their colleagues was either excellent or good.

The results of the third survey at the beginning of the 1980–81 school year are again similar to those of the first two surveys. A high 98 percent of the job sharers feel that the support they receive from their administrators is either excellent or good. The job sharers feel similarly about the quality of support from their colleagues, with 95 percent of them rating the support from colleagues as either excellent or good.

Increased job satisfaction. In the March 1980 evaluation report, we found that 81 percent of the tenured teachers participating in the pilot project felt an increase in job satisfaction while only 4 percent reported a decrease. The second survey reveals that the vast majority of tenured teachers continued to report an increase in job satisfaction at the end of the 1979–80 school year. Ninety-two percent of the tenured teachers reported an increase in job satisfaction, and no one felt that there had been a decrease. One of the tenured teachers reporting an increase in job satisfaction remarked that she had been concerned about teaching a subject which she had never taught previously. However, with job sharing she had the time to delve into the subject areas to teach the course more effectively and found that she not only enjoyed the subject but that her feelings of inadequacy had been minimized. The results of the two surveys are compared in Table 3.9.

Table 3.9

Change in Job Satisfaction Of Tenured Teachers

Change in job satisfaction	*1st survey*	*2nd survey*
Increase	81%	92%
Decrease	4	–
No change	10	3
Uncertain	5	5

The March 1980 evaluation report also noted that nearly half of the principals felt that the tenured teacher seemed happier and more satisfied with teaching since participation in job sharing. The second survey at the end of the 1979–80 school year revealed that most principals felt that the increase in job satisfaction had been sustained. Over 50 percent of the principals again observed that the tenured teacher was happier and more enthusiastic about teaching since participating in the pilot project. Typical of the comments offered by these principals is that the tenured teacher, because of the limited number of working hours and responsibilities, is better prepared, less tired, and more eager to work. Several principals remarked that the tenured teacher puts in more for the smaller amount of time required on the job and contributes lots of volunteer time. Thirty-nine percent of the principals interviewed observed no change in morale, although many commented that the tenured teacher enjoyed job sharing, and approximately 10 percent were uncertain about any changes.

The third survey at the beginning of the 1980–81 school year reveals results which are quite similar to those of the two previous surveys. Ninety percent of the tenured teachers reported an increase in job satisfaction while 5 percent did not think that job sharing has any effect, and the remaining 5 percent were as yet uncertain about any changes in job satisfaction. More than half of the principals again reported that the tenured teacher seemed happier and more satisfied with teaching while 11 percent were not aware of any changes, particularly since they were new to the schools and had no prior knowledge of the morale of the tenured teacher.

The evidence then is that the working relationships, attitudes of other school personnel, and support of other school personnel which prevailed throughout the 1979–80 school year, have all helped to sustain the increase in job satisfaction experienced by the tenured teachers participating in the pilot project. The similar responses of the tenured teachers in the third survey at the beginning of school year 1980–81 indicate that job sharing generally does result in

an increase in job satisfaction for tenured teachers.

Work productivity. Another measure used to evaluate the effectiveness of job sharing in creating a more stimulating environment for tenured teachers is the effect, if any, of job sharing on work productivity. As in the first survey presented in the March 1980 report, we determined changes in work productivity of tenured teachers in the two subsequent surveys by assessing the subjective responses of the tenured teachers and their principals. The results of the second survey show that the tenured teachers continued to feel more productive after one year of participating in the pilot project. As shown in Table 3.10, 92 percent of the tenured teachers felt that they were more productive under job sharing while 8 percent reported no change.

Table 3.10

Productivity of Tenured Teachers as Described by Tenured Teachers and Their Principals

	Tenured teachers		*Principals*	
Change in productivity	*1st survey*	*2nd survey*	*1st survey*	*2nd survey*
More productive ...	78%	92%	48%	51%
No change	20	8	25	39
Less productive	2	–	–	–
Uncertain	–	–	27	10

Table 3.10 also presents the results of the two surveys of principals who had been asked to rate the work productivity of tenured teachers participating in the pilot project for the entire 1979–80 school year. In the second survey, there was a slight increase in the percentage of principals who felt that the work productivity of tenured teachers was greater under job sharing. Most of these principals commented that the tenured teachers put in more than the required amount of time in various school activities and responsibilities. When the first survey was conducted at the beginning of the 1979–80 school year, a large percentage of principals were uncertain about any changes in work productivity as they were experiencing job sharing in their schools for the first time. However, at the end of the school year, the percentage of principals who were yet uncertain dropped to 10 percent. There was a corresponding rise in the percentage of principals who observed no change in work productivity of the tenured teacher under job sharing, although many of them maintained that the tenured teacher had always been very productive and continued to do well under the pilot project.

The third survey of tenured teachers and principals which was conducted at the beginning of the 1980–81 school year has yielded results quite similar to the results of the first survey. When asked to rate their work productivity under the pilot project, 76 percent of the tenured teachers felt that they were more productive while 24 percent reported no change. Of the principals, 44 percent felt that the tenured teacher's work productivity had increased under the pilot project, 33 percent did not think that job sharing had affected work productivity, and 17 percent were uncertain as to any changes. Only one principal felt that the tenured teacher had been less productive under the pilot project.

Quality of work. To determine change in the quality of work, tenured teachers were asked whether or not job sharing had affected the quality of their work. The March 1980 evaluation showed that 70 percent of the tenured teachers felt that job sharing had improved the quality of their work, 25 percent did not think there was any effect on the quality of their work, and 5 percent were uncertain of any changes. At the end of the 1979–80 school year, the percentage of tenured teachers who indicated that job sharing had improved the quality of their work increased to 86 percent. Eight percent of the tenured teachers felt that job sharing had no effect on the quality of their work, and the remaining 6 percent remained uncertain as to any changes.

The tenured teachers responding to the third survey at the beginning of school year 1980–81 provide answers similar to those of the first survey. Seventy-one percent of the tenured teachers felt that job sharing has improved the quality of their work, 26 percent did not think that it has any effect, and 3 percent were uncertain as to any changes. The similarity of the responses of the first and third surveys may well be attributed to the fact that they were both conducted at the beginning of the respective school year.

Principals' perception of the effects of job sharing on tenured teacher's environment. During the fall semester of the 1979–80 school year, 70 percent of the principals believed that job sharing contributed to a more stimulating environment for the tenured teacher, 23 percent were uncertain, and 7 percent observed no change. At the end of the school year, the principals were again asked to assess the effects of job sharing on the tenured teacher's environment. At that time, 77 percent of the principals felt that job sharing contributed to a more stimulating environment for the tenured teacher, 13 percent were uncertain, and 10 percent did not feel that any change was effected. The principals cited the opportunities for sharing ideas, teaching strategies, and lesson plans between job sharers as contributing to the increase in stimulation of the tenured teacher's environment. One principal also added that the tenured teacher had more time for planning and for getting together with other teachers on the faculty to exchange ideas.

The principals interviewed during the fall semester of the 1980–81 school year generally felt the same way about the increase in stimulation of the tenured teacher's environment. Approximately 67 percent of them thought that job sharing contributed to a more stimulating environment for the tenured teacher, 11 percent did not feel that any change was effected, 11 percent were uncertain, and 11 percent felt that it has had a negative impact on the tenured teacher's environment.

Impact on Quality of Education

The March 1980 evaluation report discussed the extent to which the pilot project had met the objective of providing additional stimulus for students. Although the interviews and survey of students, parents, job sharers, and principals at that time did not yield conclusive data to state that the pilot project provided additional educational stimulus for students, the subjective responses of these individuals indicated that, generally, job sharing had a positive effect on the quality of education. To validate this finding, we interviewed or surveyed the same group of parents, job sharers, and principals at the end of the 1979–80 school year. In addition, we surveyed job sharers who initially participated in the pilot project either during the second semester of the 1979–80 school year or the 1980–81 school year and principals experiencing job sharing in their schools for the first time to determine their perceptions of the impact of job sharing on the quality of education being provided.

It should be noted that the lack of any direct and objective measures of effectiveness made it difficult to determine accurately the effects of job sharing on the quality of education. The use of standardized achievement test scores of the students being taught by job sharers was discounted as a valid indicator of student progress under the pilot project because of the many other variables affecting the results.

Student satisfaction. As job sharers in the intermediate and high schools rarely have common classes, the pilot project is expected to have minimal, if any, effect on the quality of education for secondary students. The primary concern about job sharing affecting the quality of education is centered at the elementary level where many job sharers do divide the teaching responsibilities for a single class. Therefore, the March 1980 evaluation report focused on 16 self-contained elementary classes which were being taught by job sharers.

During the first semester of the 1979–80 school year, a random sample of 89 students from the 16 classrooms were interviewed to learn how they felt about being taught by job sharers. At that time, the vast majority of students (96 percent) said that they liked having two teachers and would, in fact, prefer to have two teachers again the next school year. However, since 74 percent of them were in the second grade or below, they were really unable to discern any changes in the quality of education. Moreover, as the responses of the students were overwhelmingly positive, it was doubtful that a second survey would yield any new information. Thus, it was decided that these interviews would not be repeated at the end of the school year.

Comments from parents. To secure a sample of parental feelings relating to the quality of education provided under the pilot project, a survey was conducted of the parents or guardians of the 89 students interviewed for the March 1980 evaluation report. When asked whether having two teachers for their children affected the quality of their children's education, 58 percent felt that the quality of their children's education either remained the same or improved under the pilot project. In the second survey at the end of the 1979–80 school year, the percentage of parents responding similarly to the same question increased to 76 percent. Thirty percent of the parents in the first survey were uncertain of any effects while only 16 percent in the second survey were still uncertain of any effects. In both surveys, 8 percent of the parents felt that the quality of education worsened under the pilot project.

As in the first survey, the majority of parents noticed several advantages in having their children taught by job sharers. Several parents felt that the situation provided variety which made it more interesting and challenging for their children. Many parents noticed a general improvement in their children's work and attitude towards school. The parents felt that other advantages of job sharing included having their children learn to relate to two teachers with different personalities, having two teachers who share their own particular interests with their students, and having teachers who complement each other's professional expertise. One mother commented that she believed that the experience had enabled her son to learn that two teachers are not always alike and that each had her own way of doing things. She felt that although her son was only in kindergarten, he now knew that teachers are different people, and each year, they will be different.

The views of the parents in the second survey, with respect to the disadvantages of job sharing, paralleled those of the first survey. Only three sets of parents felt that there were definite disadvantages associated with job sharing. One parent observed that the students were "lost" or "slowed" because the teachers had two different styles of teaching. Another parent was dissatisfied that neither of the teachers had brought his daughter's problems to his attention earlier in the school year, and it was only through his own discovery of the difficulties that he was able to work with one of the teachers to help his child.

The overall results of the followup survey again indicate that the majority of parents are satisfied with the education received by their children under the job sharing program. When asked if they would want their children to be taught by job sharers the following school year, 66 percent of the respondents indicated that they would want their children in a job sharing classroom, 21 percent said that it did not matter if their children were taught by job sharers, and 13 percent did not want their children to be taught by job sharers again. When these results are compared to the results of the first survey (50 percent, 33 percent, and 12 percent, respectively), there is an increase in the percentage of parents who prefer to have their children in a job sharing classroom.

In addition to responding to specific questions, many parents offered comments

about various aspects of the pilot project. As in the first survey, concern again was expressed about the need for communication between job sharers to ensure that problems developing with certain students would not be overlooked. Several parents questioned the confusion and lack of continuity which may arise from having two teachers rather than one. One parent further explained his opposition as follows: "The two teachers must both use the *same* teaching method in order to provide continuity to the students. First grade is too early a level to subject the kids to two teachers. They should relate to one authority head and avoid having to understand that two adults have different approaches to handling them. Our final word is *PAU* this concept." However, as in the first survey, more parents offered positive comments about the pilot project. Several commented on the benefits of having a second teacher particularly if the child is unable to get along with the first teacher. One parent felt that it made a big difference not only in the child's attitude toward going to school but also in how the child felt about school work and studies. The comments from other parents are summarized by another parent who wrote: "I believe the child is given a better education in a job sharing classroom. Each teacher is allowed to spend more time on . . . [the] subject, thus passing the better quality onto the students. It has been a very productive year for our son and we completely endorse the job sharing program."

Perceptions of job sharers and their principals. The effectiveness of job sharing in providing additional educational stimulus for students may also be measured by the number and ratio of job sharers and their principals who report that the pilot project raised the quality of education for students. For the March 1980 evaluation report, all job sharers and their principals were specifically asked if they felt that job sharing had affected the quality of education for students. At the end of the school year, the same question was posed to the job sharers and their principals. A comparison of the results of the two surveys is presented in Table 3.11 below.

Table 3.11

Effect of Job Sharing on Quality of Education for Students

	Job sharing teachers		*Principals*	
Response	*1st survey*	*2nd survey*	*1st survey*	*2nd survey*
Raised quality of education	70%	75%	51%	33%
No change	18	11	16	44
Uncertain	12	12	29	23
Lowered quality of education	0	2	4	0

As shown in Table 3.11, the vast majority of job sharers continued to feel that job sharing raises the quality of education for students. Most job sharers felt that they were able to provide more for their students. For example, several elementary teachers noted that their students have been able to do more creative writing as the teachers have more time to correct their papers. Others cited having more time for lesson preparation because of the fewer number of subjects and being able to provide more games and activities to enhance the learning of difficult concepts. The job sharers also reported being able to provide more individualized instruction and attention to individual problems. As an example, one teacher reported that she held more parent–teacher conferences, sent home weekly reports, and generally worked more closely with her students and parents. Many job sharers specifically felt that the quality of education was improved because they and their partners worked together to share not only teaching ideas and methods but also to diagnose strengths and weaknesses of students and discuss techniques and strategies to help them.

Only two job sharers, at the end of the 1979–80 school year, felt that job sharing lowered the quality of education for students. One teacher could not spend as much time in class preparation as he would have liked because he had another job. The other job sharer, an elementary teacher, commented that it was sometimes confusing for the students because

they had to learn from two teachers with two different personalities and teaching methods.

Table 3.11 also shows that there has been a decrease in the number of principals who definitely feel that job sharing raised the quality of education. After experiencing a complete school year of job sharing in their schools, 33 percent of the principals thought it improved the quality of education whereas 51 percent had felt similarly during the first semester of the school year. It appears that there was a definite shift among the principals from feeling that job sharing resulted in an improvement in the quality of education to feeling that it really did not have any effect on the quality of education. However, those principals who did note an improvement reported that the job sharers provided a wider range of experiences for their students. They also felt that the enthusiasm and energy displayed by the job sharers towards teaching directly benefited the students. One principal related that the job sharers took their special education class on an overnight trip, something which would have been impossible had there been only one teacher assigned to the class. Another principal reported receiving positive comments from parents whose children were taught by a job sharing team. In fact, by the end of the 1979–80 school year, he had received requests from several parents who wanted their children to be placed in a job sharing classroom the next school year.

Most principals felt that they were simply unable to measure the effect of job sharing on the quality of education although they pointed out that there is no evidence to suggest that it has had any negative effect. A few principals did observe some difficulties in the job sharing classroom, but generally they too felt that there were no adverse effects on the students. Only one principal did feel that in one particular case, job sharing did have some adverse effects. However, she attributed the problems to the new hire rather than the program itself. She also added that since it was a secondary school, the students had contact with other teachers as well and, therefore, there was no significant negative effect. Many principals were quick to caution that the increase or decrease of educational stimulus for the students was probably due more to the individual job sharer rather than the job sharing program itself.

The survey of first-time job sharers and principals taken at the beginning of the 1980–81 school year generally supports the finding that job sharing has had little, if any, adverse effect on the quality of education. Only two new hires felt that the quality of education has been lowered under the pilot project. The reason cited for this is their belief that some students are unable to relate to having two teachers. Only one elementary school principal felt that job sharing has adversely affected the quality of education. He thought that the learning process had been delayed because of the new teacher's inability to relate to her students. However, it appears that the difficulties encountered by this principal are more directly related to the teacher involved rather than job sharing itself. As in the previous surveys, most job sharers and principals felt that job sharing has had a positive effect on the quality of education.

Summary

In summary, the pilot project continues to be effective in achieving the objectives of the job sharing program. The evaluation of the pilot project at the end of the 1979–80 school year, which marked the completion of the first full school year of job sharing, essentially confirmed the findings presented in the March 1980 evaluation report. Moreover, a subsequent evaluation of the pilot project conducted at the beginning of the 1980–81 school year again yielded results which confirm the general effectiveness of the pilot project in meeting program objectives.

The vast majority of people involved with the pilot project definitely feel that job sharing is a feasible and desired employment option for teachers. The number and quality of available teaching positions for teachers unable to secure full-time positions with DOE have increased

steadily, albeit modestly, over the three-year test period. The tenured teachers participating in the pilot project consistently report an increase in job satisfaction, work productivity, and quality of work. Although there is no conclusive evidence to support the contention that the pilot project has had a positive effect on the quality of education for students, job sharing enjoys widespread support from students, parents, job sharers, DOE administrators, and representatives of the two collective bargaining units involved.

CHAPTER 4

PROGRAM COSTS

This chapter examines the total costs of the job sharing pilot project. These costs include direct operating and administrative costs as well as the initial investment or start-up costs. In the March 1980 evaluation report, data relating to these costs were presented for the 1979 spring semester and the 1979–80 school year. Although the cost data for the 1979 spring semester were based on costs actually incurred, the cost data reported for the 1979–80 school year were projected costs. Therefore, in this chapter the cost data for 1979–80 school year are adjusted to reflect actual costs including salary adjustments[1] and various personnel changes.[2] In addition, the costs of the pilot project for the 1980–81 school year have been projected to estimate the total costs of the pilot project.

Summary of Findings

We find that:

1. Direct operating costs of the pilot project continue to be less than the costs that would have been incurred by DOE without the project.

2. The administrative costs assignable to the pilot project are minimal despite the increase in the number of job sharers participating in the pilot project.

Direct Operating Costs

Direct operating costs of the pilot project include the salaries earned by the job sharers and the State's contributions to the retirement system, social security, health fund, and unemployment compensation fund. This section presents data on these costs. The cost data reported for the 1979 spring semester and the 1979–80 school year are based on costs actually incurred over a seven-month period and full school year, respectively. The cost data for the 1980–81 school year have been projected.

Salaries. The salaries earned by the job sharers for the 1979 spring semester and the 1979–80 school year and projected for the 1980–81 school year total $2,118,968. Therefore, as shown in Table 4.1 below, by the end of the 1980–81 school year, the pilot project is expected to result in salary savings totaling $440,769, when compared with salary costs if there had been no pilot project.

The reduction in salary costs is directly related to the differences between salary levels of the two teachers comprising the respective job sharing team. If the combined salaries of the two job sharers are less than the full-time salary of the tenured teacher, job sharing results in salary savings. The actual comparison on a

1. The collective bargaining contract between the State of Hawaii Board of Education and the Hawaii State Teachers Association executed January 4, 1980 provided for an across-the-board salary adjustment of 7 percent plus $20 per month, retroactive to September 1, 1979.

2. By the second semester of the 1979–80 school year, three job sharing teams had terminated, a new hire replaced another new hire, and five new job sharing teams had been formed.

Table 4.1

Comparison of Salary Costs

	Pilot project costs	*Costs without the project*	*Difference*
1979 spring semester	$ 178,842	$ 220,627	$ 41,785
1979–80 school year	810,638	970,362	159,724
1980–81 school year	1,129,488	1,368,748	239,260
Total	$2,119,968	$2,559,737	$440,769

team-by-team basis showed that in only one case did the combined salaries of the job sharers exceed the full-time salary of the tenured teacher. In all other cases, the combined salaries of the job sharing team were considerably less than the full-time salary of the tenured teachers.

In the Department of Education (DOE), the teacher's salary is based on teacher classification and length of service. As the new hires have generally been at the lower ranges in terms of teacher classification and service time, their salaries have also been at the lower end of the teacher salary schedule. The average monthly salaries for new hires for the 1979 spring semester and the 1979–80 school year were $481 and $525, respectively, while the average monthly salaries for the tenured teachers for the same periods were $744 and $801. The average monthly salaries for the 1980–81 school year are $571 for new hires and $874 for tenured teachers. This pattern of savings in salary costs will continue as long as the job sharing team consists of a tenured teacher and a new hire.

Retirement system. Membership in the Employees Retirement System is mandatory for all job sharers who are at least half-time employees. The State's contribution to the retirement system is based on the individual employee's salary at a percentage rate actuarially determined each fiscal year. For fiscal years 1978–79, 1979–80, and 1980–81, the State's share was set at 10.7 percent, 9.9 percent, and 12.0 percent, respectively. Based on these rates, the State's contributions to the retirement fund for the job sharers were $18,723 for the 1979 spring semester and $82,958 for the 1979–80 school year and is projected to be $135,533 for the 1980–81 school year for a total cost of $237,214. Had the tenured teachers been employed full-time, the State's contributions would have been $286,666. Thus, as Table 4.2 shows, the pilot project is expected to result in savings of $49,452 in retirement system contributions.

Table 4.2

A Comparison of Costs of State Contributions to the Retirement System

	Pilot project costs	*Costs without the project*	*Difference*
1979 spring semester	$ 18,723	$ 23,098	$ 4,375
1979–80 school year	82,958	99,318	16,360
1980–81 school year	135,533	162,450	26,917
Total	$237,214	$286,666	$49,452

Social Security. The State's share of Social Security contributions is based on a percentage of the individual employee's salary, up to the salary base established by federal law. For 1979 and 1980 this percentage rate was set at 6.13 percent of the employee's salary up to a maximum of $22,900 in 1979 and $25,900 in 1980. Beginning in 1981, the rate changed to 6.65 percent of an employee's salary up to a maximum of $29,700. Since these costs are a function of the salary costs, lower salary costs also result in lowering the costs of employer Social Security contributions. Table 4.3 shows that the State's contributions to teachers' Social Security accounts under the job sharing pilot project will result in cost savings of $27,851 by the end of the current school year. As with

salaries and retirement system contributions, this pattern of savings is expected to continue.

Table 4.3

A Comparison of Costs of State Contributions for Social Security

	Pilot project costs	*Costs without the project*	*Difference*
1979 spring semester	$ 10,963	$ 13,524	$ 2,561
1979–80 school year	49,692	59,483	9,791
1980–81 school year	73,149	88,648	15,499
Total	$133,804	$161,655	$27,851

Health fund benefit plans. All job sharers are eligible for enrollment in the health fund's medical, dental, and group life insurance plans. The State's share of contributions under the various plans is based on fixed amounts. Enrollment in the various health fund benefit plans is optional, and the cost to the State depends on which plan, if any, is selected and whether dependents are included for coverage under the particular plan.

Medical plan. Job sharers may enroll in one of the three medical plans available to state employees. Although the employee's share of the contribution differs according to the plan selected, the State's share was fixed at $11.00 per month for self-only enrollment and $34.50 for family enrollment prior to July 1980. At that time, the State's share was increased to $14.14 per month for self-only enrollment and $45.08 for family enrollment. As a result of the enrollment of new hires in the medical plan, the State's contributions to the medical plan are greater under the pilot project. Table 4.4 shows that the additional cost of medical plans to the State through the 1980–81 school year is expected to be $13,149.

Dental plan. Job sharers may enroll their unmarried, dependent children who are under

Table 4.4

A Comparison of Costs of State Contributions for Medical Plans

	Pilot project costs	*Costs without the project*	*Difference*
1979 spring semester	$ 3,976	$ 2,636	[$ 1,340]
1979–80 school year	9,567	5,662	[3,905]
1980–81 school year	18,333	10,429	[7,904]
Total	$31,876	$18,727	[$13,149]

19 years of age in the dental plan. Employees do not contribute to the plan; instead, the State pays the entire premium cost. Until July 1980, the cost to the State was $3.74 per month for each child enrolled. Effective July 1980, the cost increased to $4.18 per month for each child enrolled. As shown by Table 4.5, these costs are expected to amount to $3,797 by the end of the current school year.

Table 4.5

A Comparison of Costs of State Contributions for Dental Plans

	Pilot project costs	*Costs without the project*	*Difference*
1979 spring semester	$ 602	$ 445	[$ 157]
1979–80 school year	3,726	2,393	[1,333]
1980–81 school year	6,520	4,213	[2,307]
Total	$10,848	$7,051	[$3,797]

Group life insurance plan. The State contributes $2.25 monthly per employee for payment of life insurance premiums to either the health fund life insurance plan or the employee's organization if the employee is enrolled in its group life insurance plan. As

job sharing doubles the number of employees, the cost to the State for this benefit would also be expected to double. As shown in Table 4.6, the State contributed $614 for life insurance benefits during the 1979 spring semester and $2,732 for the 1979–80 school year. The contribution for the current school year is projected to be $3,456. The total additional cost for the group life insurance plan is projected to be $3,368.

Table 4.8

A Comparison of Costs of State Contributions for Group Life Insurance Plans

	Pilot project costs	*Costs without the project*	*Difference*
1979 spring semester	$ 614	$ 315	[$ 299]
1979–80 school year	2,732	1,391	[1,341]
1980–81 school year	3,456	1,728	[1,728]
Total	$6,802	$3,434	[$3,368]

Unemployment insurance and worker's compensation. Job sharers may also qualify for unemployment insurance benefits and worker's compensation benefits upon the filing of valid claims. In these cases, the State reimburses the unemployment compensation fund and the special compensation fund for the actual costs of valid claim payments and compensable injury payments, respectively.

The cost to the State for unemployment insurance benefits continues to be minimal. Two new hires who participated in the pilot project during the 1979 spring semester applied for, and received, benefits. Two other new hires who were in the project during the 1979–80 school year also received benefits. The total cost to the State for unemployment benefits amounted to $1,117. To date, no claims for worker's compensation have been filed.

The individuals most likely to file for unemployment insurance benefits would be the new hires who might not renew their job sharing contracts or be offered other employment. However, through the life of the project, only four new hires have filed for benefits.

Program cost savings. The direct operating costs incurred by the pilot project continue to be less than the costs DOE would have incurred without the project. As shown by Table 4.7, savings in direct operating costs amounting to approximately $496,000 are expected to accrue to the State as a result of the job sharing pilot project by the end of the 1980–81 school year. This is because the cost savings in salaries, retirement system contributions, and Social Security contributions offset by a wide margin the increased costs for health fund benefits and unemployment compensation benefits.

Administrative Costs

Administrative costs assignable to the pilot project include nonrecurring costs which are related to the initial development and implementation of the program and costs incurred in the normal course of ongoing program operations. DOE has not incurred additional administrative costs for the pilot project except for the cost of a few overtime hours by the clerical staff to process new hires. Other administrative costs assignable to the project are "fixed costs," i.e., costs which would have been incurred by DOE regardless of whether the pilot project had been initiated.

DOE's Office of Personnel Services has conducted two surveys of in-kind salary contributions of personnel involved with the administration of the job sharing pilot project. For each survey, DOE's state and district personnel officers, principals, and their respective staffs were requested to estimate the total number of hours spent on the pilot project. The first survey covered the period from February 1978 to October 1979; the second covered the period from February 1980 to

Table 4.7

Direct Operating Costs
Job Sharing Pilot Project Costs vs. Costs Without Project

	1979 spring semester		*1979–80 school year*		*1980–81 school year*		*Total*		
	Pilot project costs	*Costs without the project*	*Pilot project costs*	*Costs without the project*	*Pilot project costs*	*Costs without the project*	*Pilot project costs*	*Costs without the project*	*Difference*
Salaries	$178,842	$220,627	$810,638	$ 970,362	$1,129,488	$1,368,748	$2,118,968	$2,559,737	$440,769
Retirement system	18,723	23,098	82,958	99,310	135,533	162,450	237,214	286,666	49,452
Social security	10,963	13,524	49,692	59,483	73,149	88,648	133,804	161,655	27,851
Health benefits	5,192	3,396	16,025	9,446	28,309	16,370	49,526	29,212	[20,314]
Actual unemployment benefits	331	–	786	–	–	–	1,117	–	[1,117]
Total direct operating costs	$214,051	$260,645	$960,099	$1,138,609	$1,366,479	$1,636,216	$2,540,629	$3,037,270	$496,641

Table 4.8

Estimated Administrative Costs
Job Sharing In-Kind Salary Contribution
February 1978 to October 1979
and
February 1980 to October 1980

	February 1978 to October 1979				*February 1980 to October 1980*				
	Schools	*District*	*State office*	*Total*	*Schools*	*District*	*State office*	*Total*	*Total project costs*
Principals and vice-principals	$ 7,662	$	$	$ 7,662	$ 9,664	$	$	$ 9,664	$17,326
Teachers	2,273			2,273	1,782			1,782	4,055
Educational officers		4,488	9,312	13,800		3,146	3,056	6,202	20,002
Secretaries and stenographers	1,025		228	1,253	1,481		215	1,696	2,949
Personnel clerks	37	417	1,495	1,949	213	989	2,628	3,430	5,379
Total	$10,997	$4,905	$11,035	$26,937	$13,140	$3,735	$5,899	$22,774	$49,711

Source: DOE Office of Personnel Services.

October 1980. Based upon the responses and the average hourly wages for the personnel involved, the administrative costs for the first and second periods were $26,937 and $22,774, respectively. Table 4.8 presents the breakdown of costs by administrative level and personnel classification for each of the periods.

A comparison of the two periods surveyed shows that a significantly higher proportion of the total first period costs was attributable to personnel at the state level than during the second period. As shown in Table 4.8, during the first period, costs assigned to the state office amounted to $11,035, while during the second period, these costs amounted to $5,899. This decrease had been anticipated since most of the $11,035 were for nonrecurring investment costs attributable to such tasks as preparing testimony and background material for the Legislature, developing and presenting project guidelines, discussing the pilot project with the unions involved, and preparing implementation procedures. As the project has proceeded, less time has been required or spent on project coordination by state-level personnel. Most of the time now spent on the project has been on more routine tasks, such as the recruitment of new hires and the processing of personnel action forms for the job sharers.

At present, the primary cost of maintaining the pilot project is centered at the school level where the selection, supervision, and evaluation of the job sharing teams occur. Since the first survey period, costs assignable to the school level have increased by $2,143. This is not surprising since the number of job sharing teams has increased from 20 in the 1979 spring semester to 66 in the current school year. Consequently, principals and vice-principals, in the aggregate, have had to spend more time on the pilot project. There has also been an increase in costs assignable to school support staff, i.e., secretaries, stenographers, and personnel clerks who are responsible for initially contacting new hire applicants and maintaining individual personnel records.

Overall costs at the district level have decreased although there has been an increase in time spent on the pilot project by personnel clerks because of the increase in the number of job sharers. However, educational officers at the district level have expended less time on project coordination and responses to inquiries from school administrators and teachers as they have become more familiar with job sharing rules and procedures. Most of the time currently spent by the educational officers has been in the areas of assisting schools with the new hire recruitment and selection process.

Summary

Savings in direct operating costs continue to accrue to the State because of the job sharing pilot project. While there are administrative costs associated with the project, they continue to be minimal, despite the increase in the number of job sharers. Moreover, these administrative costs are costs which have been incurred by DOE in any event. The main cost savings consideration is that as long as the new hires continue to earn less than the tenured teachers, savings should continue to accrue to the State in salary costs and retirement system and Social Security contributions, and they would more than offset the additional costs in health fund benefits and other costs incurred by the pilot project. If the program continues, either on a pilot or permanent basis, substantial cost savings should continue to result.

CHAPTER 5

CONSIDERATIONS IN ESTABLISHING JOB SHARING AS A PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT OPTION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The evaluation of the job sharing pilot project indicates that it has been generally effective in achieving its objectives. Thus, the Legislature may wish to establish job sharing as a permanent employment alternative in the Department of Education (DOE). In this chapter, we analyze job sharing as a permanent employment alternative. We also identify those issues which need to be considered and resolved if the Legislature decides to establish job sharing as a permanent program.

Summary of Findings

In general, we find that:

1. There is a strong case for establishing job sharing as a permanent employment option in DOE.

2. The restrictions imposed by Act 150, SLH 1978, as amended, on the pilot project have had varying effects on project participation. The statewide limitation of 100 job sharing positions has not prevented anyone from participating in the pilot project although there are indications that more employees may apply for positions in the future if the program is permanently established. However, the restrictions limiting project participation to (a) tenured, certificated DOE employee/new hire pairings and (b) new hire replacements for job sharers who terminate before the end of the contract period, may be unduly constraining. There have also been indications that some tenured employees have been unable to participate in the pilot project because of the reluctance of their supervisors to approve job sharing applications.

3. The provision in Act 150, SLH 1978, as amended, which allows tenured employees participating in job sharing to retain their membership in the collective bargaining unit but specifically excludes new hires from the same coverage, appears to be inconsistent and has contributed to the inequity in the rights and privileges granted to the new hires.

4. Although one of Act 150's assumptions is that job sharing would be beneficial for employees close to retirement, in actuality, participation in the job sharing program adversely affects their retirement benefits.

5. Variances among teaching conditions and requirements in the different schools continue to result in inconsistent and, sometimes, inequitable treatment of job sharers. In addition, the inability of new hires to earn probationary credit and tenure status under these conditions and requirements may be a disincentive for them to participate.

6. There have been operational difficulties related to the recruitment and selection of new hires.

Job Sharing as a Permanent Employment Alternative in DOE

There are several reasons which support the establishment of job sharing as a permanent employment alternative in DOE. *First*, our evaluation of the pilot project during its three-year test period indicates that it has been effective in achieving the objectives established for the job sharing program. *Second*, the pilot project has proven to be cost-effective. *Third*, the proposal to establish job sharing as a permanent program in DOE enjoys widespread support from all groups in DOE. *Fourth*, job sharers in the pilot project as well as other certificated DOE personnel and teacher applicants have expressed considerable interest in applying for future job sharing positions, if the program is established on a permanent basis. *Finally*, the results of a number of programs and demonstration projects across the nation provide additional evidence supporting job sharing as an alternative employment option.

Effectiveness of program. As reported in Chapter 3, the evaluation of the pilot project disclosed that it has been effective in achieving the objectives of the job sharing program. Job sharing has been found to be a feasible and desired employment option for teachers. It increases the number and quality of the types of available teaching positions for unemployed teachers. In creating a more stimulating environment for tenured teachers in their professional capacities, it also enables them to experience an increase in job satisfaction, work productivity, and quality of work. Moreover, job sharing appears to have a positive effect on the quality of education.

Program costs. Although the job sharing program was not expressly designed to be a cost savings measure, considerable overall cost savings have accrued to the State as a result of the pilot project. As reported in Chapter 4, the additional costs in health fund benefits, unemployment compensation benefits, and certain administrative expenditures have been more than offset by cost savings in the areas of salary costs and retirement system and Social Security contributions. Since the savings are directly related to the difference in salaries between the tenured teachers and new hires, no changes in program cost trends are foreseen as long as the new hire earns less than the tenured teacher.

Support for establishment of permanent program. The strongest support for establishing job sharing as a permanent program in DOE comes from individuals who have been directly involved with the pilot project. The overwhelming majority of job sharers, principals, DOE administrators at the district and state levels, and collective bargaining officials who have been involved with the pilot project advocate the establishment of job sharing as a permanent employment alternative in DOE. In addition, surveys taken of other certificated DOE personnel and principals who have not participated in the pilot project indicate that the majority also feel that job sharing should be established on a permanent basis.

Job sharers. As previously discussed in the March 1980 evaluation report and Chapter 3 of this report, nearly all of the job sharers, tenured teachers as well as new hires, report that participation in the pilot project has enabled them to fulfill their personal objectives. Thus, it is not surprising that they strongly support the retention of job sharing as a permanent employment option in DOE. In fact, in both the first and second surveys, 99 percent of the job sharers were in favor of instituting job sharing in DOE on a permanent basis. Similar results were also obtained from the third survey of job sharers. In this group, 95 percent of the job sharers advocate the retention of the program on a permanent basis while the remaining 5 percent are as yet uncertain.

Principals. As the principals retain the authority to approve or deny all job sharing requests in their respective schools, their feelings about the retention or termination of the pilot project are especially important. Three separate surveys were conducted to determine how the principals who have been involved with the pilot

project feel about establishing job sharing as a permanent employment option in DOE. All three surveys show that the majority of participating principals are in favor of establishing job sharing in DOE on a permanent basis. The results of the surveys are summarized in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1

Principals Involved in Pilot Project: Their Feelings About the Establishment of Job Sharing as a Permanent Employment Option in the Department of Education

Responses	*1st survey*	*2nd survey*	*3rd survey*
Should be made permanent	84%	90%	83%
Should not be made permanent ...	7	8	11
Uncertain	9	2	6

DOE administrators. DOE administrators at the state and district levels were also queried as to their feelings about permanently establishing job sharing in DOE. A survey conducted during the first semester of the 1979–80 school year disclosed that 56 percent of the DOE administrators interviewed were already in favor of establishing job sharing as a permanent employment option while 38 percent expressed uncertainty about it at the time. The remaining 6 percent did not feel that it should be permanently established.

A second survey conducted a year later revealed some changes in position. The results of this survey show that 80 percent of the DOE administrators at the state and district levels now favor the establishment of job sharing as a permanent employment option in DOE. The remaining 20 percent do not feel that the program should be continued beyond the three-year test period.

Collective bargaining unit representatives. Representatives of both the teachers collective bargaining unit, Hawaii State Teachers Association (HSTA), and the educational officers and classified personnel bargaining unit, Hawaii Government Employees' Association (HGEA), are in favor of establishing job sharing as a permanent employment option in DOE. Although the teachers bargaining unit does recognize that there are some issues and problems which must be resolved, it views the pilot project as having worked out satisfactorily. HSTA officials note that its members who have participated in the pilot project are pleased with job sharing and that job sharing is an innovative, efficient way of meeting the needs of different people. Similarly, the educational officers and classified personnel bargaining unit reports that positive comments have been received about the pilot project.

Nonparticipating teachers. During the 1979–80 school year, a survey was conducted among 50 tenured teachers who were not participating in the pilot project but were working in the same schools as the job sharers. As these teachers had the opportunity to observe the implementation of job sharing in their schools, they, too, were asked whether or not job sharing should be established as a permanent employment option in DOE. Their responses revealed that 88 percent were in favor of permanently establishing job sharing in DOE, 4 percent were opposed to its permanent establishment, and 8 percent were uncertain about it.

Nonparticipating principals. There is some support for the establishment of job sharing as a permanent employment option in DOE even among principals who were not directly involved with the pilot project during the 1979–80 school year. A survey of these principals shows that 55 percent of them were already in favor of permanently establishing the program, 39 percent indicated uncertainty about its permanent establishment at this time, and the remaining 6 percent did not think that it should be instituted in DOE.

Future interest in job sharing. To determine the extent of future interest in job sharing and potential program size, surveys of job sharing tenured teachers, nonparticipating certificated DOE personnel, new hires, and DOE teacher applicants have been conducted. The results of

these surveys indicate not only that interest in job sharing will continue to be significant in the future but that the number of future participants will probably increase.

Job sharing tenured teachers and nonparticipating certificated DOE personnel. As the program is currently designed, an eligible certificated DOE employee must first submit an application for job sharing before the full-time position is converted to two half-time positions. Thus, the number of potential job sharers is directly related to the number of certificated DOE personnel who intend to apply for such positions. Currently, the rate of tenured teachers who return to participate in the pilot project the following school year averages around 50 percent. Should this return rate continue, there will probably be at least 30 tenured teachers who will apply for job sharing positions for the 1981–82 school year, if the program is permanently established by the Legislature.

There are also indications that even if the tenured teachers do not choose to continue job sharing the ensuing school year, they are likely to apply for job sharing positions in the future. For example, four tenured teachers who job shared during the 1979 spring semester but terminated participation in the pilot project for the 1979–80 school year are again job sharing during the 1980–81 school year. Moreover, as 55 percent of the tenured teachers in the group of 1979 spring semester job sharers continued to job share the following school year, this now means that a substantial majority of that group participated in the pilot project at least twice.

It is altogether possible that this trend will continue if the program does become established on a permanent basis. Of the 47 tenured teachers who participated in the pilot project for the entire 1979–80 school year, 27 continued to job share during the 1980–81 school year. A survey of the remaining 20 tenured teachers who did not return to participate in the pilot project reveals that all of them would apply for a job sharing position sometime in the future if the program is accorded permanent status. Moreover, in a subsequent survey of tenured teachers whose involvement in the pilot project has been only in the 1980 second semester or the 1980–81 school year, the vast majority also declare that they would apply for a job sharing position in the future. In this particular survey, 95 percent of the tenured teachers indicate that they would apply for a future job sharing position if the program is permanently established, while the remaining 5 percent are as yet uncertain about reapplying.

In addition to the continuing interest in job sharing expressed by job sharing tenured teachers, a survey of other certificated DOE personnel also reflects some interest in job sharing among employees who have yet to participate in the program. Certificated DOE personnel were specifically asked to indicate whether or not they would apply for a job sharing position under a permanently established program in DOE for the 1981–82 school year, the 1982–83 school year, or some future school year. Of the 498 individuals who responded to the survey, the numbers of certificated DOE personnel who said that they intend to apply for job sharing are, respectively, 13 (2 percent) for the 1981–82 school year, 15 (3 percent) for the 1982–83 school year, and 97 (20 percent) for some future school year.

The aforementioned surveys of the extent of interest and the desirability of job sharing indicate that should the program become permanent, the number of job sharing positions may be expected to increase considerably. Since the total number of certificated DOE personnel is approximately 9000 and if the 2 and 3 percent figures from the survey are used to project potential program size for the next two school years, the number of job sharing positions for each of the two years may well exceed the present limit of 100 positions. This projection is in addition to the number of participating tenured teachers who intend to apply for job sharing positions under a permanently established program. However, it should be noted that an accurate prediction is difficult to make, since numerous factors may influence the

number of personnel participating in any particular school year. These factors include general economic conditions, the immediate financial and personal needs of certificated DOE personnel, and the availability of new hires.

New hires and teacher applicants. Under the present program, a tenured teacher is allowed to job share only after a new hire counterpart has been selected. Therefore, another measure to estimate potential program size is the number of new hires and teacher applicants expressing an interest in job sharing. For both the 1979–80 and 1980–81 school years, the return rate of new hires to the pilot project was 45 percent. If this return rate continues, there is the likelihood that at least 30 new hires will return to job share in the 1981–82 school year should the program continue.

Although most new hires prefer full-time positions, the forecast for future new teacher vacancies in DOE remains discouraging. Therefore, we conducted a survey of new hires who participated in the pilot project during the 1979–80 school year but did not return the following school year to learn whether they would consider applying for a job sharing position again in the future if they are unable to obtain a full-time position with DOE. In addition, this same question was posed to new hires whose participation in the pilot project was limited to the second semester of the 1979–80 school year. The results of these surveys disclosed that 62 percent of the new hires would apply for job sharing positions under such circumstances, 25 percent were uncertain about applying, and 13 percent would not reapply.

Considerable interest in job sharing also exists among teacher applicants. A survey of a sample of teacher applicants seeking employment with DOE for the 1980–81 school year reveals that 61 of the 175 respondents (35 percent) did apply for positions in the pilot project although they were not selected for new hire positions. Their reasons for applying for job sharing positions are essentially the same as those cited by the new hires in the pilot project. The foremost reason is their desire to enter the DOE system and be employed in a regular teaching position. Other reasons cited include the opportunity to gain teaching experience, more time for their family and/or personal needs, a preference for a part-time position, and the feeling that a job sharing position may help to lead to a full-time position.

The survey of teacher applicants also indicates that they are interested in job sharing in the future. Of the 175 teacher applicants responding to the survey, 100 (57 percent) express an interest in applying for a job sharing position in the 1981–82 school year if they are unable to obtain a full-time position, 101 (58 percent) say they would apply for the 1982–83 school year, and 88 (50 percent) think they may apply in some future school year.

In the future, job sharing may have a greater impact on the teacher surplus in the State if the program is permanently established and if more certificated DOE personnel continue to choose it as an alternative employment option. Moreover, should teacher applicants continue to find it difficult, if not impossible, to secure full-time positions with DOE, then the impact of job sharing will probably be even greater. As reflected by the surveys, a growing number of teacher applicants may have to resort to such alternative employment opportunities as job sharing in order to obtain employment in regular teaching positions in the future.

Job sharing in other states. Although the establishment of the pilot project in DOE marked the introduction of job sharing to the public sector in Hawaii, there have been several other states which have initiated and implemented a variety of job sharing programs and projects. The experiences of these states appear to support the premise that job sharing is emerging as a feasible and viable alternative approach to the traditional workweek concept. The following includes brief summaries of these other programs and projects.

One of the earliest job sharing programs began in 1965 in Framingham, Massachusetts, where 120 pairs of teachers volunteered to job share. The teachers were paired according to complementary skills, geographic proximity, and agreement on time division. The subsequent evaluation of the program demonstrated that it had resulted in qualitative benefits for both students and teachers. The program received the enthusiastic support of teachers, administrators, students, and their parents.

In the 1970s, job sharing was permitted in several school districts in California. A preliminary report on job sharing in nine Bay Area school districts revealed results similar to those derived from the evaluation of the Hawaii job sharing pilot project. The job sharers and administrators found that the program has helped not only to achieve personal and career goals but also to diversify and strengthen the schools' instructional programs. The executive director of the Palo Alto Educators Association concludes that for those whose personal, financial, emotional, and professional goals can be met through job sharing, the concept is educationally sound and provides a lightening of the load of career teachers as well as more jobs for new young teachers. The study concludes that job sharing is one means of continuing and enhancing quality in education without incurring increased costs.

Job sharing programs have also included positions in fields other than teaching. The city of Palo Alto, California, began its program in 1974 with two shared positions located in the Animal Service and Placement Center and the Baylands Nature Interpretive Center. In the following year, a librarian position was converted to job sharing. Information from the job sharers, their supervisors, and coworkers, as well as from other employees, administrative staff, and a union representative, showed that job sharing would be a worthwhile program to implement. The study of the program found that job sharing seemed to improve the quality of work and increase employee satisfaction, appeared to be a viable way of structuring work to better accommodate working women, and could be a solution to unemployment under certain conditions.

Under a two-year grant from the U. S. Department of Labor, Wisconsin developed and implemented a job sharing project for state employees. Project JOIN (Job Options and Innovations), which was initiated in 1976, involved 60 full-time positions which were shared by 120 employees. A study of the project showed that the cost of employing job sharers was almost equal to the cost of employing full-time workers. The job sharers took less sick leave and had a lower rate of turnover than their full-time counterparts. A majority of the job sharers and their supervisors felt that there was an increase in productivity after participating in job sharing. The results of the study also indicated that the job sharers were more satisfied with their jobs than the full-time workers. This project is continuing under the alternative work patterns section of the Wisconsin Department of Administration.

Interest in expanding permanent part-time employment opportunities in state government has led to the enactment of legislation by several states. In 1974, Massachusetts enacted a law to enable all executive agencies to utilize persons who choose to be employed for a reduced number of hours per week. This act has resulted in an increase in the number of part-time employees although the numerical target (6 percent in each class and in each grade of all classified positions in executive agencies) had not been met. In 1975, Maryland passed legislation promoting permanent part-time employment in the executive branch. As in Massachusetts, there has been an increase in the number of permanent part-time employees since the program was started, but the numerical target (3 percent of all classified executive positions) has also not been met. Nevertheless, most Maryland officials who have used part-time employees consider the arrangement successful.

In 1977, Oregon established job sharing as a means of improving management and providing

more employment opportunities in the state agencies. The job sharing program in Oregon grew from 149 positions to 377 positions within less than a year of its initiation. During the same year, the governor of Colorado issued an executive order endorsing job sharing and urging all state agencies to implement the concept. Colorado's Department of Personnel subsequently found that job sharing would benefit both the state and its employees and would result in additional costs only in the areas of state contributions to group health and life insurance plans.

Although job sharing in the United States is considered to be fairly new, the growing number of programs and projects in the public sector reflect not only a recognition of the need for alternative work patterns but also of the positive benefits job sharing appears to provide. In addition, the similarity of the results of all of these programs and projects, including Hawaii's pilot project, appears to attest to the soundness and viability of job sharing as a feasible alternative employment option.

Conclusion. With job sharing providing a satisfying employment alternative for a growing number of tenured teachers, with an additional avenue of employment being available to some unemployed teachers, with indications that educational quality is enhanced, with job sharing receiving widespread support among all groups involved, and with the State realizing significant cost savings, the evidence runs strongly in favor of establishing job sharing as a permanent employment option in DOE. In the remaining sections of this chapter, we identify the issues that need to be considered and resolved if the Legislature decides to make the program permanent.

Eligibility Restrictions

Act 150, SLH 1978, as amended, currently imposes certain eligibility restrictions on participation in the pilot project. These restrictions include limiting participation in the pilot project to: (1) 100 full-time positions, statewide; (2) tenured, certificated DOE personnel/new hire pairings; (3) new hire replacements for job sharers who terminate before the end of the contract period; and (4) employees who have obtained the concurrence of their immediate supervisor, appropriate personnel officers, and the superintendent. In this section, we assess the effects of each of these restrictions on project participation and discuss the implications for future program participation.

Restriction to 100 positions, statewide. Section 2 of Act 150 restricts the pilot project to a maximum of 100 full-time positions, statewide. As tenured teacher applicants for the 1979 spring semester and 1979–80 and 1980–81 school years have numbered considerably less than 100 each time, this restriction has not prevented any tenured teacher from participating in the pilot project. However, considerable interest in future participation in the program has been expressed by job sharing tenured teachers as well as nonparticipating certificated DOE personnel. There are indications that the number of applicants may well exceed the present allotment of 100 full-time positions if the project becomes a permanent program in DOE. The question, then, is whether this restriction should be retained, revised, or removed completely if job sharing is established as a permanent employment option in DOE.

As previously discussed, approximately 2 percent of the respondents in a sample of certificated DOE personnel indicated that they intend to apply for a job sharing position for the 1981–82 school year if the program is permanently established. As the total population of certificated DOE personnel is around 9000 employees, an application of the 2 percent figure to the total would yield a projection of 180 employees, far more than the 100 allotted positions. Although there might not be 180 tenured employees actually applying for job sharing positions for the 1981–82 school year, the number of applicants may well approach the 100 position limit, especially since approximately 50 percent of the tenured teachers

currently participating in the pilot project are expected to reapply for positions in the next school year.

At the present time, the majority of DOE administrators at the district level do not feel that a specific restriction should be placed on the total number of positions allotted for job sharing within DOE. They do not anticipate a significant increase in the number of people who would apply even if the restriction were to be removed. One administrator who favors removal of the restriction maintains that the number of job sharing positions should be controlled at the school and district levels, depending on the situation. Those who do favor retention of the restriction observe that limitations should be set, because it is easier to establish restrictions from the beginning rather than to have to take away positions should the numbers wanting to job share become too unwieldy.

At the state level, all but one administrator advocate the removal of any restrictions on the total number of job sharing positions, statewide, within DOE. The administrator who favors retention of the restriction feels that 100 positions appear to be within the workload capacity of the present staff. Any increase in the number of positions may significantly affect the workloads of the personnel staff as most of the initial screening of new hire applicants, compiling of eligibility lists, coordination, and processing of employment forms are completed by the state office. The other administrators do not see a necessity for placing a limit on the program. They note that rather than not enough applicants, the problem is not too many "takers." Another administrator points out that the approval process itself should be self-restricting and, therefore, would tend to keep the program within manageable range.

The teachers' bargaining unit favors a restriction on the total number of positions allowable for job sharing. Officials say that although the program has worked satisfactorily for all concerned, there is, nonetheless, a "point of diminishing return," where too many job sharing teams may negatively affect the students. However, at the present time, they are unable to fix an optimum number of positions which should be allotted and suggests, instead, that DOE "float the number of positions and see what happens." The educational officers' bargaining unit is not opposed to increasing the number of allotted positions, particularly if the principals retain the authority of approval for any job sharing positions in their respective schools.

In view of the underutilization of the allotted positions in the pilot project, the removal of the position limitation may appear at this time to be a moot point. However, consideration needs to be given to the trend of increasing participation, and there appears to be a considerable number of potential job sharers who are interested in future participation. Over the longer term, the limitation of a permanent job sharing program to a maximum of 100 full-time positions may prove to be unduly arbitrary and constraining.

Restriction to tenured, certificated DOE employee/new hire pairings. The half position created by job sharing is restricted to new hires only, thereby disqualifying tenured or probationary certificated DOE personnel from filling these positions. This restriction appears to have been included to ensure more employment opportunities for unemployed certificated personnel. However, it appears that it may have also precluded the possibility of other benefits which may result from different pairing combinations.

There may be some merit in allowing two tenured teachers to share a position. One of the benefits for allowing the pairing of two tenured teachers would be the creation of a vacant full-time position. This position may be filled in a number of different ways. If the full-time vacancies created by tenured teacher pairings were to be restricted to new hires, there may be an increase in the number of applicants and, consequently, a rise in the quality of applicants; an increase in the number of employment opportunities available to them; and a

greater impact on the number of unemployed teachers. From a management standpoint, the full-time vacancies may be utilized to accommodate displaced tenured teachers. If the positions were to be used in this manner, then the tenured teacher who is unassigned would have first priority in being offered the position. Next in line would be any probationary teachers, and finally, any new teacher applicants.

In a reduction-in-force situation, allowing two tenured teachers to share a position may enable the affected teachers, who would otherwise be placed in the pool of unassigned tenured teachers, to remain at their present school. However, in this situation, a full-time vacancy would not be created. Therefore, job sharing in this case would not increase the employment opportunities for unemployed teachers although, technically, it may be viewed as a means of keeping tenured teachers from joining the ranks of the unemployed. On the mainland, in a few school districts suffering from declining student enrollment, job sharing has been offered as an alternative to the termination of teaching contracts.

In a school district where new hire applicants have not been plentiful, several tenured teachers and principals have complained about the quality of the new hire applicants and the lack of choices. In some cases, tenured teachers wanting to job share have been unable to participate in the pilot project because of the inability of DOE to fill the new hire positions. In at least one situation, two tenured teachers who were unable to participate in the pilot project because the distant location of the school did not attract any new hire applicants, may have been able to share a position if this had not been contrary to the existing restriction. In another case, a tenured teacher participating in the pilot project refused to reapply for another school year as she did not want to face the prospect of having to work with an inexperienced teacher again. She strongly recommended that the restriction be removed and that the option of allowing job sharing between two tenured teachers be offered instead.

In a study of job sharing in the schools of nine Bay Area school districts, two administrators felt that the job sharing option should be available to tenured teachers only. One administrator thought that the most important consideration in approving a proposal for job sharing was "proven compatibility"—that sharers should already have successful experience working together.

A diagnostic prescriptive teacher who is considering job sharing if it is established as a permanent program also suggests that the program be amended to allow the pairing of two tenured employees. She notes that under present program restrictions, there may be some difficulty in finding a new hire who would have the qualifications and experience necessary to fill a diagnostic prescriptive teacher's position. She also points out that it may be difficult to fulfill the job sharing requests of others such as district resource teachers if the present restriction limiting the second half position to new hires is retained.

Although allowing the pairing of two tenured employees appears to have several advantages, this option in turn raises several questions. Of foremost concern is the determination of retention rights to a specific position. Under the present situation, the tenured employee retains the rights to the converted position and is, therefore, able to return on a full-time basis to the position at the termination of the contractual period. If two tenured employees job share, then there is a question as to who retains the right to what position or whether both of them do. If tenured employees are allowed to job share for an indefinite period of time and still retain their rights to their original positions, this means that the employee occupying the vacated position would never be able to gain rights to the position since it would be obligated to one of the job sharing, tenured employees. One principal points out that the problem of retention rights to a position may become even more complicated if another tenured teacher who has been displaced from a different school fills the vacated position. He wonders what would

happen if the job sharers decide to return to teaching full-time, and the displaced teacher has the most seniority among the three of them. Another principal feels that the problem of retention rights may be more easily resolved if the vacated position is filled by a new hire who is informed of, and accepts, the retention rights of the tenured employee.

Some reservations have also been expressed as to whether the removal of this restriction would be contrary to the legislative intent of the program. As there is no guarantee that the full-time vacancies would be filled by new hires, enabling two tenured employees to job share may defeat the purposes of providing more employment opportunities for unemployed teachers and getting new people into the system. One principal feels that the restriction should be removed only in cases where there are no new hire applicants. Otherwise, he notes job sharing would exclude the new hire applicants and do little in improving the employment opportunities of recent teaching graduates.

The determination of work schedules and division of workload is also viewed by many as another potential problem area. At present, the tenured teacher is responsible for proposing how the position is to be shared. Therefore, the tenured employee has the distinct advantage of selecting the schedule and other arrangements. The new hire generally has to decide whether or not to accept what is left. Job sharing under the present design favors the tenured employee. If two tenured employees job share, then the question is whether the preferences of one should have priority over the other.

The March 1980 evaluation report revealed widespread support for allowing two tenured employees to share a position. Subsequent surveys also disclose that most of the people involved with the pilot project continue to feel that the restriction should be removed. At the state level, all but one of the DOE administrators interviewed favor the removal of the restriction limiting the job sharing team to the tenured employee/new hire pairing. At the district level, the majority of the administrators support the removal of the restriction. Both bargaining units saw no reason for not allowing the tenured employees to share a position. Nearly 90 percent of the principals surveyed agree that two tenured employees should be allowed to share a position. Furthermore, among the tenured teachers surveyed, the vast majority feel that restriction should be removed. Only two tenured teachers favor retention of the tenured employee/new hire pairing.

In summary, the advantages of allowing two tenured employees to job share and the widespread support for this option suggest that the option should be permitted if a job sharing program is permanently established. However, the issues of retention rights of the tenured employees to their old positions, the manner in which the vacated full-time positions would be filled, and the procedures and precedence in deciding on work and time schedules need to be resolved before allowing tenured employee pairings.

Restriction of the position to job sharing after its conversion. Under the provisions set forth in Section 3(7) of Act 150, as amended, a job sharing position cannot be converted back to a full-time position until the contractual agreement has been terminated. A job sharing vacancy created by the resignation, retirement, or other permanent or temporary severance of employment with the DOE by any job sharer must be filled by recruiting another individual. However, in several instances when such vacancies have occurred during the pilot project, the job sharing position has been reconverted to a full-time position.

Two tenured teachers terminated their participation in the pilot project at the conclusion of the first semester of the 1979–80 school year. The two tenured teachers went on leave, and both of their positions were reconverted to full-time positions which were subsequently filled by their new hire counterparts.

Near the conclusion of the first semester of the current 1980–81 school year, seven new hires terminated participation in the pilot project. In three of these cases, the tenured teachers returned to full-time teaching when their new hire counterparts left. The remaining four new hire vacancies were filled by other new hires as the tenured teachers wished to continue participation in the pilot project.

While DOE has not always complied with the aforementioned provisions of Act 150, it does not appear that its noncompliance has resulted in any negative effects. In fact, the assumption of the reconverted positions by the job sharing new hires for the remainder of the school year has been especially advantageous for the new hires and the school. The new hires were happy to obtain a full-time teaching position, even on a temporary basis, and the principals were pleased that they were able to hire someone who already knew the students and the particular school. Therefore, the necessity for maintaining this restriction is questionable.

When the pilot project was established, there evidently was some concern that a tenured teacher whose position was converted to a job sharing one may ask that it be reconverted to a full-time status before the end of the contractual period. The Legislature felt that this would be unfair to new hires and discourage their participation in the pilot project. At the same time, it was felt that the tenured teacher should not be required to return on a full-time basis if the new hire terminated before the end of the contractual period. Thus, the provisions committing the position to the job sharing pilot project after it had been converted from full-time, were included.

Rather than having a restriction which is really not being enforced consistently, it may be more reasonable to allow the principals some latitude in determining whether or not the job sharing team should be preserved after the departure of one of its members. Some principals note that there is no way of preventing someone from breaking a contract, especially new hires who really want full-time positions. Therefore, it may be particularly disruptive at the elementary levels to have sets of different teachers during the course of the school year. To promote continuity, it may be better for the remaining job sharer to work on a full-time basis, if the remaining member is willing to do so. However, an automatic takeover by the remaining partner may be neither advisable nor possible in every case. Consequently, the best solution would be to render a decision to continue or terminate job sharing in such circumstances on a case-by-case basis.

Restriction to employees with prior concurrence. Section 3(2) of Act 150, as amended, restricts participation in the pilot project to employees who have obtained the concurrence of their immediate supervisor, other appropriate personnel officers, and the superintendent. The handbook developed by DOE for the implementation of the pilot project further states the following: "[T]he job sharing arrangement must be approved by the principal. It shall be accomplished in a manner that meets the educational needs of the students and in a manner that does not create hardship or otherwise necessitate unreasonable job adjustments for other teachers and employees in the school."[1] Thus, the tenured teachers wanting to participate in the pilot project have had to have their job sharing proposals first approved by their principals. There have been indications that some tenured teachers have had some difficulty in getting their principals to allow them to job share. The question then is whether or not principals should retain the authority to approve or deny job sharing requests if the program is permanently established.

Part of the reluctance of some principals to even provide the job sharing option to the tenured teachers on their staff may be due to some preconceived biases about the program. This is apparently not uncommon as even principals who are now enthusiastic supporters of the program had initial reservations about allowing the pilot project to be implemented in their respective schools. As the evaluation of the

1. Department of Education, *The State of Hawaii Department of Education Job Sharing Pilot Project*, September 1978, p. 2.

pilot project showed that most participating principals are very supportive of the tenured teachers' desire to job share, we conducted a survey of principals who have not been involved with the pilot project to determine whether their feelings about job sharing would prevent other tenured teachers from participating should the program be permanently established. The survey disclosed that in at least three instances job sharing requests submitted for the 1980–81 school year were denied by some principals. In addition, the principals cited a number of perceived shortcomings about the program.

The two most commonly cited shortcomings were that (1) it would be difficult to divide hours and responsibilities, and (2) job sharing would affect continuity in instruction and would not meet the needs of students. However, our evaluation shows that the first cited shortcoming has not been insurmountable, and the second has not materialized. Other preconceived shortcomings mentioned by the principals, such as lack of support from parents, lack of professionalism that would result from job sharing, and lack of accountability for instruction, are unfounded. It appears, then, that at least some principals may be basing their reservations about job sharing on misconceptions about the program.

Although some employees may still meet with resistance from the supervisors if they desire to job share, at this time, should the program be permanently established, there is no compelling reason to recommend the removal of the restriction limiting participation to employees who have received the prior approval of their immediate supervisors, generally principals. As the principals are the individuals most responsible to and knowledgeable about the communities, they should retain the authority to approve or reject job sharing requests based on their assessment of the needs of their schools. However, it should be made clear to DOE personnel, particularly principals, that it is legislative and DOE policy to support and encourage a voluntary job sharing program, and that the tenured employees should not be denied the right to apply for a position or an opportunity to job share without specific and sufficient reason. Should the program be permanently established and the right of approval or denial of job sharing requests retained by the principals, personnel officers, and the superintendent, a concerted effort should be made to disseminate information and educate all decision-makers about job sharing and dispel personal biases about the program.

Collective Bargaining Considerations

Section 3(5) of Act 150 allows the tenured employees participating in the pilot project to retain their membership in the collective bargaining unit but specifically excludes new hires from collective bargaining representation. As the provisions of Act 150 clearly define legislative intent, union membership for job sharers in the pilot project has not been an issue. However, should the program be permanently established, the question of who can or should be allowed to join the collective bargaining unit will surely be raised. In this section, we assess the effects of collective bargaining on job sharing and, conversely, the effects of job sharing on collective bargaining.

Collective bargaining agreement. The HSTA is the exclusive representative of the collective bargaining unit consisting of teachers and other personnel of the DOE under the same salary schedule, pursuant to Section 297–33(d), HRS. The terms of the present agreement between the State of Hawaii Board of Education and HSTA do not specifically prohibit job sharing in DOE. However, as the tenured teachers in the pilot project retain their membership in HSTA, they also retain at least half of the rights and privileges negotiated for and agreed upon under the terms of the contract. For example, the tenured teacher in the pilot project is entitled to 35 minutes a day of duty-free time (15 minutes for lunch and 20 minutes for preparation). However, new hires who are not eligible for union membership are not entitled to the same privileges accorded the tenured teachers under the teachers' contract.

Another provision of the collective bargaining agreement between the State and HSTA requires the State, within budget limitations, to provide teachers with desks with lockable drawer space and closet space to store personal articles. In at least one case, the principal at a secondary school found it necessary to use discretionary funds to purchase a separate desk and filing cabinet for the new hire as the tenured teacher apparently did not want to share her desk and cabinet. The question raised was whether tenured teachers who job share can demand separate equipment as is their right under the collective bargaining agreement or whether they should share their equipment with their new hire partners. Thus, it appears that the effects of job sharing on specific provisions must be further examined.

Statutory provisions. Section 89–6(c), HRS, specifically excludes part-time employees working less than 20 hours per week from membership in any collective bargaining unit. The HSTA petitioned the State of Hawaii Public Employment Relations Board (HPERB) for a declaratory ruling on the following questions regarding the interpretation of Section 89–6, HRS.

> "... In the case of teachers or other instructional personnel whose jobs require substantial outside preparation time, does the exclusion in 89–6(c) of a 'part time employee working less than twenty hours per week' refer only to time spent teaching, or can it include the normal time required to prepare course material, correct examinations, attend faculty meetings or conduct other activities directly related to the job?
>
> "... Is a teacher who works less than '100% of full-time equivalency (FTE)' but at '50% FTE or more' pursuant to DOE Regulation 5112, and is eligible to receive retirement and the other benefits set forth in that regulation, included in Unit 5?"

On January 5, 1981, HPERB ruled that "the 20-hour cut-off in HRS, Section 89–6(c) refers only to time spent teaching, or to the number of hours for which an employee is hired." Further, HPERB ruled that "if a teacher works less than 20 hours per week, that teacher is not included in Unit 5 nor entitled to coverage under HRS Chapter 89."

The HPERB ruling that half-time teachers are not eligible for coverage under the collective bargaining statutes holds a number of implications for the job sharing program. It would appear that job sharers would be affected by this ruling since they are half-time teachers who work 17½ hours per week. Thus, should the program be permanently established, it would seem that all job sharers, tenured teachers and new hires, would not be entitled to collective bargaining representation. This may seriously affect the program as the tenured teachers who now retain their union membership may not be willing to participate in job sharing if they must relinquish their membership for the duration of their participation.

Should the program be established on a permanent basis, the Legislature may wish to consider amending the statutes to extend eligibility for collective bargaining coverage to teachers who work less than 100 percent of full-time equivalency (FTE) but at 50 percent or more FTE. At the present time, other state employees who work at 50 percent FTE are entitled to collective bargaining coverage, but it is because their workweek is based on 40 hours and, consequently, a half-time position requires 20 hours per week. Teachers, on the other hand, work 35 hours per week at 100 percent FTE, and therefore, a half-time position requires 17½ hours which is 2½ hours short of the 20 hours necessary for coverage under Chapter 89, HRS. It seems inconsistent that a half-time employee is not entitled to the same rights as another half-time employee, particularly when the excluded employee, because of the nature of the position, may be required to spend more than the official workweek or classroom time in work-related tasks.

New hires and the collective bargaining unit. When the pilot project was established, provisions were made to ensure that the tenured employees would not lose tenure, seniority, or any other employee benefits or rights because of their participation in the pilot project. As such, they are specifically allowed to retain their membership in the collective bargaining unit.

However, as previously discussed, new hires are specifically excluded from collective bargaining coverage and, therefore, are not guaranteed the same rights and privileges accorded the union members under the terms of the collective bargaining agreement. Although most principals have attempted to provide the new hires with the same rights and privileges, in some cases, they have not been able to do so. Thus, there have been inequities in the treatment of tenured teachers and new hires.

One proposal is to extend membership in the collective bargaining unit to new hires if the program is permanently established and the tenured teachers are allowed to retain their union membership. Interviews and surveys with DOE administrators, tenured teachers, and new hires about this proposal reveal varying degrees of support.

Sixty-seven percent of the DOE administrators interviewed at the state and district levels do not feel that new hires should be included in the collective bargaining unit if the program is permanently established. Their objection is based primarily on their understanding that under the present collective bargaining law the new hires are not eligible for membership. They also note that extending union membership to new hires would be inconsistent with the current practice of excluding other non-job-sharing, half-time DOE employees from collective bargaining coverage. Twenty-four percent of the DOE administrators do feel that new hires should be granted union membership and that other half-time DOE employees should also be included if the new hires are extended collective bargaining coverage. The remaining 9 percent of the DOE administrators are as yet uncertain about this proposal.

The strongest support for extending union membership to the new hires comes from the tenured teachers. Approximately 68 percent of the tenured teachers are in favor of extending union membership to new hires. One tenured teacher urges union membership for new hires to ensure that their rights will not be abused, while another states that as new hires carry the same responsibilities, they should be awarded the same rights and privileges. Several tenured teachers advocate the extension of union membership to new hires if it is offered on an optional basis. One tenured teacher explains that new hires should be able to join the union only if they so desire because as beginning teachers, earning only half a salary, the service fees may be too much for some to afford. Another tenured teacher who feels that her new hire counterpart should be allowed to join the union says that there should be a corresponding reduction in service fees for the tenured teachers. Only 3 percent of the tenured teachers feel that the new hires should continue to be excluded. The remaining 29 percent are uncertain about extending union membership to new hires at this time.

As new hires themselves are directly involved, it was expected that they would be overwhelmingly in favor of being members of the collective bargaining unit. However, they are slightly less supportive of this proposal than the tenured teachers. Approximately 60 percent of the new hires surveyed feel that they should have collective bargaining coverage, 10 percent want to be excluded, 27 percent are as yet uncertain, and the remaining 2 percent did not respond to the question. Those who do want union membership contend that they should be provided collective bargaining coverage as they have the same duties and responsibilities of tenured teachers who are covered.

The teachers' union maintains that membership in the collective bargaining unit should be extended to new hires. An official of the collective bargaining unit feels that there really is no good reason to exclude new hires particularly since other half-time state employees are included in the respective collective bargaining units. Of course, the implication is that if new hires under job sharing are allowed union membership, the same right should be extended to the 200 other half-time teachers in DOE. Therefore, the Legislature in its consideration over the extension of collective bargaining

coverage to the new hires in the program, must also consider whether or not the other half-time DOE employees should receive the same right.

Effect on Retirement Benefits

At the time of its establishment as a pilot project, job sharing was viewed as being beneficial for individuals close to retirement. It was believed that the decrease in workload resulting under job sharing would be less traumatic than the total loss of work a person faces upon retirement. Moreover, the extra time available under job sharing would enable the near retiree to develop other interests and make future plans. However, since its inception, the pilot project has not attracted a significant number of near retirees.

The people near retirement are discouraged from job sharing for two main reasons. *First*, under job sharing, retirement service credits are accumulated on a proportionate basis. Thus, a job sharer who serves a full year earns six months of retirement service credit. In this respect, job sharing may prolong the number of years until retirement for some individuals. *Second*, retirement benefits are based on the highest three years of an individual's earnings. Consequently, a decrease in the salaries of near retirees, who are at the peak of their earning power, may also affect the highest three years of earnings on which they would want to base their retirement benefits.

The disincentive for near retirees to participate in job sharing not only precludes them from receiving benefits received by other job sharers but also denies the State and the new hire counterpart an opportunity to participate in an arrangement which may be mutually beneficial for everyone involved. For example, as discussed in the chapter on program costs, the cost savings resulting from job sharing is primarily due to the difference in salary levels between the tenured teacher and the new hire. As the near retiree job sharer would probably be at the higher end of the salary schedule, and the new hire generally at the entry level, the difference between the salaries of the two job sharers is likely to be even greater than in most of the teams participating in the pilot project. Consequently, an increase in participation in the program by near retirees would result in even greater cost savings for the State than what is now being realized by the pilot project. Another advantage of forming a job sharing team consisting of a near retiree and a relatively young, inexperienced new hire would be the opportunity gained by the new hire to learn and benefit from working with someone with significantly more experience. Moreover, the students may also benefit from the complementary nature of such a team. For these reasons, the Legislature may want to consider and examine various incentive plans designed to attract more retirees to the program should it be permanently established.

Some retirement incentive suggestions which were mentioned during the course of our evaluation include: (1) cash bonuses to those job sharing tenured teachers qualifying for retirement, the bonuses to be funded from the savings accruing from tenured teacher–new hire salary differentials; (2) allowing job sharing tenured teachers nearing retirement to "buy" their retirement by contributing to the retirement system amounts equal to what they would have contributed if they had been on full-time salaries; and (3) providing job sharing tenured teachers with credit for a full year of service for each job sharing year.

The adoption of any of the foregoing incentive suggestions would require amendment to the present statute governing the retirement system. There is precedence for some of the suggestions mentioned. The federal government, under its civil service retirement program, gives employees who work on a part-time regularly scheduled basis, such as four hours a day, five days a week, full calendar credit for all time elapsing between dates of appointment and separation. In California, a teacher who is at least 55 years old and who wishes to work part-time, can have retirement benefits based on

full-time employment if both the teacher and school district elect to make the required retirement contributions.

As to the impact of job sharing on the retirement system generally, it has been suggested that job sharing may affect the state's contributions to the system. However, the actuary for the retirement system, in response to a request for projections as to how job sharing would affect acturarial determinations of state contributions to the retirement fund, stated as follows:

> "In general, we do not expect that job-sharing will have any effect on the actuarially-determined employer contribution rates–unless such programs are expanded substantially and cover on the order of at least 1,000 full-time jobs or 2,000 job-sharing employees . . ."[2]

From the foregoing, a permanent DOE job sharing program is not likely to affect the actuarial determinations of state contributions to the retirement system, inasmuch as our survey of potential participation in job sharing indicates that the numbers would not approach the numbers cited by the actuary.

Teaching Conditions and Requirements

Other than the general guideline that each job sharer should work one half of the total hours required of the full-time position and perform one half of the work responsibilities, Act 150 does not outline any specific teaching conditions or requirements. Although DOE has agreed to comply with certain teaching conditions and requirements outlined in the contract between DOE and the teachers' bargaining unit, it generally has some flexibility in determining how the job and related responsibilities are to be assumed under the pilot project.

As discussed in the March 1980 evaluation report, the flexible nature of the program has contributed to differences in teaching conditions and requirements which, from the viewpoint of some job sharers, has resulted in treatment that is inconsistent and inequitable. These concerns relate to workload and compensation; the duty-free lunch and preparation periods; the assignment, compensation, and arrangements of job sharers doing substitute teaching; the length of the contractual period; and probation and tenure for new hires.

Workload and compensation. Under the pilot project, the principal retains the authority to approve or reject job sharing proposals and to assign responsibilities for teaching and school-related functions and activities. In some cases, principals have requested that work schedules be revised to provide for a more equitable division of workload. In other situations, they have required that certain conditions be accepted by the teachers if they want to job share.

To illustrate, because it is often difficult to achieve a 50–50 division of instructional time at many secondary schools where full-time teachers have five teaching periods daily, principals have had to resort to a variety of methods to ensure equity of workloads of the job sharers. Some principals have added another class section and have assigned the job sharing partners three teaching periods each. For the 1980–81 school year, 32 of the 36 job sharing teams in the secondary schools carry six teaching periods. However, in 23 cases, the fact that both job sharers teach three periods each adds an additional class section to the school. In two other job sharing teams, the tenured teachers teach two periods while the new hires teach three periods, and in the remaining two teams, the job sharers alternate teaching three periods one week and two the next. As presented in the March 1980 evaluation report, the arguments for and against each type of arrangement remain the same:

> "While the 3–3 split ensures the equity of the job sharers' workloads, several job sharers feel that this has resulted in a 60 percent workload for 50 percent of the pay. Although they do not feel that the workload creates a serious hardship, they maintain that as a matter of principle the compensation rate should be adjusted to 60 percent. This solution has a number of ramifications. The most obvious is that resultant costs may be more than that which would have been incurred by the State without job sharing. Also, if each job sharer were paid

2. Letter dated January 19, 1979 from Martin E. Segal Company to Mr. Stanley Siu, Executive Secretary, Employees' Retirement System of the State of Hawaii.

at 60 percent of the full-time equivalency (FTE) instead of 50 percent, the FTE would then total 120 percent and, as such, would not meet the definition of job sharing. Moreover, any change in the rate of compensation may also affect the permanent part-time teachers in DOE who currently carry three teaching periods.

"If the rate of compensation were to be adjusted to reflect the actual workload, then it would appear that the 2–3 splits would also need to be adjusted accordingly. This would then mean that one job sharer would be paid at a 60 percent rate while the other would be paid at a 40 percent rate. However, there may be difficulties in finding teachers who would be willing to work for less than half pay.

"The 2–3 teaching load for one semester reversed to 3–2 for the second semester appears to be equitable over the period of a year. However, there may be a problem if one of the job sharers, for some reason, is unable to finish the school year or if the job sharing arrangement is terminated before the end of the contract period. Another problem may arise if the third period, for which teaching assignments are switched after the first semester, is a full-year course rather than a semester course. There could be a break in teaching continuity and a need for some adjustments on the part of the students.

"The majority of the secondary school principals feel that the addition of another section is justified on the basis that the school should receive some benefit from the increase in administrative and clerical workload resulting from the pilot project. They also note that a 2½–2½ division is not practical, and a 3–2 division may be demoralizing and unfair to the job sharer who has the heavier workload. Some principals have tried to balance the addition of the ½ period by reducing the job sharer's responsibilities in other nonteaching areas."

In addition to the teaching workload, the job sharers are also responsible for the nonteaching functions and activities assigned by the principals. A few principals fail to consider that the job sharers actually occupy only one position and utilize the additional individual to lessen the nonteaching responsibilities of the staff. In these cases, the job sharers are actually being assigned more responsibilities than what would normally be required for a full-time teacher.

There appears to be no easy solution to the problem of the equitable division of workload and corresponding compensation for job sharers in secondary schools with only five teaching periods. In essence, what is at issue is the very definition of job sharing as stated in the enabling legislation. Section 2 of Act 150, as amended, defines job sharing as follows:

"Job-sharing, for the purpose of this Act, is the voluntary equal division of one full-time permanent position between two employees, each performing one-half of the work required for the permanent position."

However, Section 5 of the same act states as follows:

"Job-sharing is, for the purpose of this Act, the voluntary sharing of a full-time, permanent employee's position with another employee, with each working one-half of the total number of hours of work required per week, and with each receiving half of the salary to which each is respectively entitled and at least half of each employee benefit afforded to full-time employees."

The first definition specifically addresses workload and does not appear to permit the flexibility DOE has taken in adding a sixth period in schools where the full-time teacher's responsibilities consist of five teaching periods per day. The second definition, however, addresses itself to the amount of time required under job sharing rather than the amount of work required. The utilization of the second definition of job sharing does give DOE more flexibility in arranging the job sharers' workloads to meet the needs of the school and students as long as they do not exceed the required number of hours per week.

The question then is whether the division of a position for job sharing should be based on the number of required work hours, the workload, or both. It should be further noted that even under normal conditions, the workloads of the secondary teachers are not always the same. The present teachers' contract does allow DOE to alter the number of teaching assignment schedules provided that the instructional time per workweek does not exceed 1415 minutes. Thus, before the issue of division of workload and compensation can be resolved, the definition of job sharing itself requires clarification. It must also be remembered that any changes in workload or compensation guidelines for job sharers may also have implications for other permanent half-time DOE teachers.

The duty-free lunch and preparation periods. As discussed in the two previous reports on job sharing, the sharing of the duty-free lunch and preparation periods has emerged as an issue in

the implementation of the pilot project. At present, the tenured teacher is entitled to 35 minutes a day of duty-free time (15 minutes for lunch and 20 minutes for preparation). However, DOE maintains that it is not obligated to include the other halves of the two duty-free periods in the new hire's work day. As new hires are not eligible for union membership, the teachers' bargaining unit is unable to insist that they be granted the same privileges accorded the tenured teachers under the teachers' contract. Therefore, DOE allows the principals to decide how the 35 minutes of duty-free time are to be utilized.

The majority of the DOE administrators, principals, tenured teachers, and new hires involved with the pilot project agree that the new hire should be able to have the remaining halves of the two duty-free periods if this can be accommodated within the respective school's schedule. However, this is not always possible as the duty-free lunch and preparation periods are already scheduled at specific times. Thus, whether or not the new hire has duty-free periods depends on when the person teaches. As the tenured teacher has first choice on teaching times, the teacher may end up with both, none, or only one of the two duty-free periods. In a few cases, the tenured teacher has even signed a written waiver of the right to the 35 minutes of duty-free time guaranteed by the teachers' contract. Whether or not the new hire has any duty-free time depends on the remaining work schedule.

The evaluation of the pilot project further reveals that more tenured teachers and new hires at the elementary level are likely to have both duty-free periods than their counterparts at the secondary level. It appears, then, that class scheduling, particularly at the high school level, may not be amenable to providing both job sharers with duty-free periods. In these cases, the new hires who do not have any duty-free periods spend their time in classroom teaching.

It should also be noted that there are approximately 200 other permanent half-time teachers in DOE who are ineligible for membership in the teachers' bargaining unit and consequently do not receive time for duty-free lunch or class preparation time. Therefore, if the job sharing program is permanently established and new hires are granted these benefits, the question of benefits for the permanent part-time teachers would also require consideration.

Substitutes. The two previous reports on job sharing discussed the problems relating to substitutes. Despite DOE's efforts, certain administrative issues continue to surface. Specifically, they relate to the assignment procedures, the rate of compensation for job sharers who substitute for their partners, and the kinds of arrangements made by job sharers for substitutes.

Assignment procedures. DOE policy is for all personnel interested in substituting to be placed on district lists. Teachers who are ill contact code-a-phone operators who then call substitutes on the district lists. When job sharers are willing to substitute for their partners, they must still register for the district substitute list, but are the first ones called to substitute for their partners. However, at the district level, a few minor procedural problems still arise with each new group of job sharers. For example, a few new hires in the current school year are on the substitute lists in districts other than the one in which they are job sharing. Some job sharers still were unaware of the requirement that they must register for the substitute list at the district office.

Compensation rate. Job sharers who substitute for each other continue to be compensated for substitute work at the per diem rates established for substitutes rather than at the daily rate of their own salaries. This results in a considerable difference in remuneration, especially for tenured teachers. Still 46 percent of the tenured teachers in our current survey report that they substitute for their new hire counterparts. In fact, the rate of compensation does not appear to be a particular deterrent in the decision of those tenured teachers who choose not to substitute. The majority of these teachers

indicate that they choose not to substitute because they feel that doing so would defeat the purpose of job sharing. They either are unable or do not desire to relinquish their extra time for substituting.

As discussed in the March 1980 evaluation report, DOE did establish a partial day compensation schedule, effective September 1, 1979, to alleviate some of the difficulties it has had in securing part-time substitutes and to partly address the issue of substitute compensation for job sharers. This schedule is presented again in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2

Partial Day Compensation Schedule For Substitute Teachers

Official duty time worked plus 30 minutes	*¼ day increments*
Up to 1 hr. 45 mins.	.25 day
1 hr. 45 mins. to 3 hrs. 30 mins.	.50 day
3 hrs. 31 mins. to 5 hrs. 15 mins.	.75 day
5 hrs. 16 mins. and more	1.00 day

Source: DOE Memo to Substitute Teachers, August 24, 1979.

As shown by the schedule, the compensation for a substitute teacher who works less than a full day is calculated on one-fourth day increments based on official duty time worked plus 30 minutes granted for work-related activities conducted prior to or following the official duty time worked.[3] Questions still remain about the propriety of this method of calculating compensation although it obviously benefits the job sharers as well as all other partial day substitutes. For example, the calculation of compensation by one-fourth day increments does not appear to comply with the statutory requirement that compensation be based on a daily rate of pay.[4] Moreover, there is some question about the inconsistency shown by DOE in granting an extra 30 minutes of time to substitutes when preparation time is not normally guaranteed to permanent half-timers or job sharing new hires. In the case of the job sharer who substitutes, the extra 30 minutes added to the official duty time of 3 hours and 30 minutes, credits that teacher with 4 hours and thus entitles the teacher to be compensated at .75 day rather than at .50 day.

Arrangements for substituting. A job sharer is given first preference in substituting for a partner. Our survey of the arrangements for substituting for the 1980–81 school year indicates that most job sharers, particularly the new hires, have agreed to substitute for their partners. However, a number of job sharers continue to enter into informal agreements regarding substituting which, as pointed out in the March 1980 evaluation report, may result in some difficulties.

The concerns expressed about these informal agreements remain the same. The most common type of agreement is where the partners agree to substitute for each other on a "trade-off" or reciprocal basis, i.e., the job sharer covers the partner's assigned teaching hours in return for the same coverage at another time within the duration of the contract. On the surface, it appears that this type of arrangement is advantageous to the students who either know the substitute or, at the secondary level, have to adjust to only one replacement. The principals are generally pleased with this type of arrangement as it assures them of having a readily available substitute. They note that it is often difficult to get substitutes for only a partial day. Moreover, the job sharer who substitutes is already familiar with the school facilities, procedures, and policies and may more easily follow up with the teacher who is absent, since they already know each other. Also, job sharers do not lose in terms of pay.

3. Official duty time worked is defined by DOE as time that the substitute teacher is on duty in accordance with the official work schedule of the regular teacher being replaced.

4. Section 297–33(i), HRS, states: "... Per diem rates shall be derived from annual rates in accordance with the following formula: Per Diem Rate = Annual Salary Rate divided by 12 months divided by 21 Average Working Days per Month."

Despite its advantages, this type of "trade-off" arrangement does have drawbacks. Some problems may develop if: (1) the communication and working relationship between the job sharers are less than satisfactory, (2) a job sharer leaves the project before repaying the partner for the time owed, or (3) one job sharer ends up owing the partner additional time at the end of the contract period. Moreover, as leave credits are not utilized under this type of reciprocal coverage, the potential for abuse exists in that the job sharer may actually take more sick leave or even personal leave than that to which the person is entitled.

Length of contractual period. Section 6 of Act 150, as amended, states that "participation in the pilot project shall require the commitment on the part of all parties to a contractual agreement; provided that the employee shall be given the option to contract for one or more years." Although it is not explicitly stated, the implication is that the job sharing contract would be for a full school year. Under the project guidelines, DOE has established the contract period to be a full academic year. However, as the number of applicants for each school year of the pilot project has been less than the limit, DOE has allowed some tenured teachers to job share on a semester basis. Several individuals involved with the pilot project have also suggested that consideration be given to allow employees to job share for less than a school year if the program is permanently established.

To determine whether or not job sharing for less than a school year is desirable and feasible, a survey was conducted of the DOE administrators, principals, and job sharers who were involved with the pilot project during the 1979–80 school year and/or the 1980–81 school year. Only the tenured teachers' group favors the option to job share for less than a school year. Varying responses were received from the other groups.

DOE administrators. Only a few DOE administrators at the state and district levels feel that teachers should be allowed to job share for less than a complete school year, but they also maintain that the minimum length of time allowable should be one semester. Most DOE administrators believe that allowing the teachers to job share for less than a school year may meet the needs of the job sharers but may be disruptive for the students.

Principals. Approximately 62 percent of the principals surveyed are against the option of allowing teachers to job share for less than a school year, 33 percent are in favor of such an option, and the remaining 5 percent are as yet uncertain. The general consensus of those who do not feel that teachers should job share for less than a school year is that a change in teachers would be too disruptive to the school and students and may hinder the continuity of the instructional program. They also believe that it may be especially difficult to find a new hire who is willing to job share for less than a school year. The principals who are willing to allow teachers to job share for less than a year stipulate that the length of the contractual period should be, at a minimum, one semester. The majority of this group of principals are from secondary schools where some of the courses are conducted on a semester basis.

Tenured teachers. The strongest support for allowing teachers to job share for less than a complete school year comes from the tenured teachers. Approximately 53 percent of the tenured teachers responding to the survey feel that job sharing should be allowed for less than a school year while 16 percent think that job sharing should be a commitment for the whole school year and 31 percent are as yet uncertain about this option. The tenured teachers favoring job sharing for less than a year do not think that the students would be adversely affected by a change in teachers if the change were to be effected at a logical break in time, e.g., the end of the semester. They also suggest that some teachers may be able to afford participating in the program on a semester basis but not for a full school year.

New hires. The new hires in the pilot project are evenly divided on the question of job sharing for less than a school year. Thirty-seven percent of the new hires favor job sharing on less than a full school year basis, 37 percent disagree with the option, and 26 percent are as yet uncertain. The new hires at the secondary schools are more likely to favor job sharing for less than a school year while those at the elementary level maintain that the students need more consistency and stability.

In summary, then, it would appear that allowing tenured teachers to job share for less than a full school year may be inviting unnecessary problems. However, all who have been involved with the pilot project agree that a job sharing arrangement should be terminated before the end of the contractual period if it proves to be detrimental to the students and the school.

Probation and tenure for the new hires. At the present time, new hires employed under the pilot project are given temporary teaching contracts. As such, they do not earn probationary credit for their teaching time and are not eligible for tenure status. While most new hires are grateful for the opportunity to teach on a regular basis, some question the equity of the employment conditions under the job sharing program. The new hires would like the right to earn probationary credit and, thereby, tenure status if the program is established on a permanent basis. They point out that they are assuming one half of the duties and responsibilities of the tenured teachers and feel that they are entitled to this right. Moreover, job sharing does not offer them any employment security as their participation in the program may be terminated by DOE with 24 hours' notice if a job sharing arrangement does not work out as planned. Additionally, their acceptance of a job sharing contract precludes them from being considered for other teaching positions.

There is a mixed range of opinions among DOE administrators, principals, and tenured teachers about the granting of probationary credit and, ultimately, tenure status to new hires under the job sharing program.

DOE administrators. The majority of DOE administrators at the state and district levels do not feel that probationary credit should be granted to new hires under the present employment conditions in DOE. However, they realize that if new hires are allowed to accrue probationary credit, it may help in the recruitment process.

Principals. A survey of principals involved with the pilot project reveals that most of them are in favor of granting probationary credit to the new hires if the program is established on a permanent basis. Approximately 72 percent of the principals interviewed feel that the availability of probationary credit would serve as an incentive to attract quality new hires to the program. They agree that the new hires work hard and deserve some credit. Some also feel that if the new hires do become eligible for tenure, the probationary period should be extended to four years rather than the two years now required. They do not think that tenure should be granted after only two years of job sharing as the new hire works only half a day and may not be able to be properly evaluated during the short period of time.

About 18 percent of the principals do not believe that the new hire should earn probationary credit or tenure under the job sharing program. They question whether the new hires can be evaluated properly since they work only on a half-time basis. Some principals point out the inequity in granting probationary credit to new hires if the teachers on temporary teaching assignments continue to be ineligible for the same right. The remaining 10 percent of the principals surveyed are as yet uncertain about granting probationary credit for new hires.

Tenured teachers. Although the tenured teachers were not specifically polled on the question of probationary credit for new hires, a number of them suggested that the new hires should have the opportunity to earn proba-

tionary credit under the job sharing program. However, they also add that they would like to retain the rights to the full-time position.

As discussed in the March 1980 evaluation report, probationary credit and tenure status may be desirable, but even if the job sharing program is permanently established, this may not prove to be realistic or practical under present employment conditions. Currently, the tenured teacher retains the rights to the teaching position occupied by the job sharers. Thus, even if the new hire were able to fulfill the required probationary period by job sharing, tenure could not be obtained unless there exists an unobligated teaching position. This may prove to be difficult because: (1) the tenured teacher is not likely to relinquish rights to the teaching position; and (2) the number of unobligated teaching positions in DOE is not expected to increase. There is also the consideration that tenured teachers who have lost positions in particular schools because of reduction in staff situations have first priority on any open positions.

Recruitment of New Hires

Although the pilot project has been implemented by DOE without too much difficulty, there have been some complaints about job sharing from people involved in the pilot project. Most of these complaints relate to the time spent in contacting and interviewing new applicants and the recruitment of qualified new hires.

The process. At present, the recruitment and selection process for the new hire position is initiated upon the approval of the tenured teacher's application and work proposal for a job sharing position. The DOE's Office of Personnel Services develops a list of qualified new hire applicants for each position from DOE's teacher applicant pool. This list is then forwarded through the appropriate district office to the school principal. The school support staff contacts the applicant and arranges for an interview time. The principal, often together with the tenured teacher, interviews the new hire applicants and selects one to fill the new hire position. Upon approval of the principal's recommendation, the new hire is offered a temporary teacher's appointment agreement which sets forth the terms of the contract.

Time spent in contacting and interviewing new hire applicants. Much of the administrative costs assignable to the pilot project at the school level is due to the time spent by principals and clerical staff in contacting and interviewing new hire applicants. Although the interviewing of each applicant is necessary to ensure the protection of the rights of all applicants and to select the best qualified teacher, many of the applicants on the list are either unavailable or are not really interested in job sharing. Some principals have had to go through more than one list of candidates before one was selected.

Complaints from the schools indicate that the lists of applicants are outdated. Many of the teachers on the lists were already employed and not looking for another job. Other teachers could not be contacted although numerous attempts had been made. Still others are not really interested in job sharing but go through the process simply because they are afraid that to refuse the interview would somehow jeopardize their chances of being considered for full-time positions. It appears then that the workload of the school personnel may be considerably reduced if the lists of applicants were prescreened by the district offices before being forwarded to the various schools. It should be noted that some district offices have assisted some schools with this task especially during the summer months when the schools are not in session.

One principal also notes that much of the interview time is being spent in providing information about the pilot project to the applicant. She suggests that a summary sheet briefly describing job sharing and outlining the benefits and terms of the pilot project be given to the applicant at the time the person indicates an interest in participating. This would enable the schools to make better use of the interview time.

Difficulties in recruiting qualified new hire applicants. DOE was able to find a counterpart for each of the tenured teachers wanting to job share in the 1979 spring semester. However, DOE did experience some difficulty in recruiting new hire applicants for the 1979–80 and 1980–81 school years. New hire applicants could not be found for five of the positions for the 1979–80 school year and eight of the positions for the 1980–81 school year. Moreover, for some schools, the number of qualified new hire applicants was less than expected or desired. Consequently, the tenured teachers who wanted to job share were asked to resume their full-time positions because of the lack of qualified new hire applicants to fill the positions.

There are several reasons for the new hire vacancies. *First,* a majority of them are in school districts which have experienced difficulties in filling even full-time positions for certain teaching lines. For example, three out of the five 1979–80 unfilled positions were in the math/science fields for which there was no surplus of teachers in the district. For the 1980–81 school year, a majority of the positions are in school districts other than on Oahu and are at the secondary level in the areas of English, art, industrial arts, and special education. *Second,* some of the schools are located a long distance from the areas in which most of the new hire applicants live. Thus, the commute time would not justify their working on a half-time basis. *Third,* there is no knowledge or very limited knowledge among teacher applicants about the job sharing program. Thus, although more qualified teacher applicants might consider applying for a position, they have not applied because they simply are not aware of the existence of such a program or do not have sufficient information about the working conditions and benefits available under the program. To illustrate, a survey of 114 teacher applicants who did not apply for a job sharing position in the pilot project reveals that approximately 40 percent of them were unaware of the pilot project. The same survey also discloses that some teacher applicants have misconceptions and negative notions about job sharing.

Should job sharing be permanently established in the DOE, more effort should be expended in informing the teacher applicants about the program. Several tenured teachers already question the adequacy of DOE's efforts in recruiting new hire applicants. They note that publicity relating to the pilot project has been relatively scarce and that better results may have been obtained if DOE had specifically advertised for all of the job sharing positions.

Recommendations

The foregoing issues can be separated into those which are: (1) related to the requirements established by law for the job sharing program and are thus matters to be considered by the Legislature; (2) related to the implementation of the job sharing program and are thus matters for consideration and resolution by the DOE in consultation with the appropriate collective bargaining unit; and (3) related to the efficiency by which the job sharing program is implemented and are thus problems which should be resolved by the DOE. Accordingly, if the Legislature decides to establish job sharing as a permanent program in the DOE, we recommend that:

1. The Legislature remove certain eligibility restrictions now imposed by Act 150 to allow for increased participation in the program. The specific recommended changes involve:

a. Removal of the restriction limiting the program to 100 positions.

b. Removal of the restriction limiting participation in the program to tenured, certificated DOE employee/new hire pairings so as to allow two tenured employees to share a job.

c. Removal of the restriction requiring a new hire replacement for the job sharer who terminates participation in the program before the end of the contract period so as to permit a job sharing position to revert to a full-time position.

2. The Legislature consider whether the collective bargaining statute should be amended to provide collective bargaining coverage for half-time certificated DOE personnel.

3. The Legislature consider retirement incentives for the near retirees who choose to participate in the job sharing program if the Legislature decides that encouraging near retirees to job share should continue to be an objective of the program.

4. DOE work with representatives of the appropriate bargaining unit to resolve issues related to the following:

a. The position retention rights of tenured, certificated DOE personnel if they are allowed to pair as job sharers.

b. How workload can be divided more equitably and compensation provided accordingly.

c. Provision of the duty-free lunch and preparation periods.

d. The assignment, compensation, and arrangement of substitute teaching when it is performed by job sharers.

e. The conditions under which new hires might be granted probation and tenure.

5. DOE work to resolve the operational problems relating to the recruitment and selection of new hires by:

a. Screening and updating the new hire applicants list before it is forwarded to principals or supervisors.

b. Disseminating more information about the job sharing program to potential applicants and advertising for all job sharing vacancies.

6. DOE make known to all concerned personnel, especially principals, that it is legislative policy that the job sharing program be supported and that all applicants be provided with a fair opportunity to participate.